

1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18541

Mr. JAVITS. As to the nursing schools, the bill is related to both hospital affiliated nursing schools as well as nonhospital affiliated nursing schools, but those which are affiliated with colleges and universities. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. That is correct. The nursing schools are classified in the college 4-year courses in nursing, then in the 2-year courses, what are referred to as trade school courses, or 2-year courses in college, and then what are referred to as schools in hospitals.

Mr. JAVITS. None of these are schools for profit?

Mr. HILL. None. They are all non-profit schools. Any money must go to nonprofit or public schools.

Mr. JAVITS. We do not necessarily have anything against private schools, but we want an understanding of the quality of the bill.

Finally, the bill will provide not only for registered professional nurses but practical nurses as well. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. I may add that it provides for teachers, instructors, and trainers in practical nursing, with the idea of training more practical nurses.

Mr. JAVITS. There are few professions in which shortages are greater than in nursing. A number of our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol, especially the women Members of the House, Mrs. Bolton of Ohio in particular, who has long been a friend of nurses, and was herself a nurse before she came to Congress, have been strongly in favor of this particular bill. I hope the Senate will act favorably on it.

Mr. HILL. The House passed the bill unanimously. There was no opposition to the bill in the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the committee amendments are considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc.

The committee amendments were agreed to en bloc, as follows:

On page 9, line 15, after the word "private", to insert "diploma"; on page 29, line 2, after "June 30," to strike out "1964" and insert "1965"; at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "1964" and insert "1965"; in line 9, after the word "section", to strike out "631 (c)" and insert "825(c)"; in line 12, after the word "facilities", to insert a comma and "and section 603(a) of such Act is amended by striking out clause (4), by striking out 'and' following the semicolon at the end of clause (3), and by inserting 'and' after the semicolon at the end of clause (2)"; and in line 20 after "July 1," to strike out "1964" and insert "1965".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, has the report been filed?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the report be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be printed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may the RECORD show that the report was submitted in advance of passage, because there are matters in the report with respect to the way the act will be administered which are very important as to the way it will be done, as expressed by the committee which reported the bill.

THE NURSE TRAINING ACT OF 1964 NEEDED NOW

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a recent study of a representative group of hospitals showed a 20-percent shortage of professional nurses and an 18-percent shortage of practical nurses. Projections into the near future indicate that by 1970 we will need an additional 185,000 professional nurses to provide adequate service in general hospitals. The Surgeon General's Consultant Group on Nursing reports that by 1970 there will be an overall demand in this country for 850,000 trained professional nurses. This distinguished group felt, however, that 850,000 was a goal impossible of achievement and set a more realistic target of 680,000 professional nurses by 1970. They feel that the latter figure can be reached if a broad enough program of incentive and assistance is enacted immediately.

Mr. President, the Nurse Training Act of 1964 is the program. Under this bill, grants would be provided for the construction and rehabilitation of nursing schools and for strengthening, improving, and expanding their training programs. The existing program of traineeships for advanced training of professional nurses would be expanded. And a student loan program, modeled after the National Defense Education Act and the Health Professions Assistance Act, would be established.

Mr. President, I have nothing but admiration for every nurse I have ever known. The high level of skill demanded by the nursing profession requires a long period of training. The ever-increasing complexity of medical techniques is constantly raising the already high level of skill which must be attained. After graduation the nurse can look forward to long hours and low pay. Of course, being a nurse provides rewards of its own through the happiness gained from helping others.

But low pay is still low pay, Mr. President. I wish that we could do something now about raising the pay scale for this dedicated group of women. If we cannot do that, at least we can ease the burden involved in becoming a nurse. This bill would to some extent accomplish this latter aim.

The sum of \$17,710,000 is authorized for 1965, increasing to \$82,880,000 in 1969. This is money well spent. It is time that we do something for the nurses who every day do so much for the people. At the same time we will be providing for a sufficient number of nurses to meet future needs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### ASSISTANCE IN THE PROVISION OF GRADUATE OR SPECIALIZED PUBLIC HEALTH TRAINING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of H.R. 11083.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11083) to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the authorization for assistance in the provision of graduate or specialized public health training, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has approved H.R. 11083, which has been passed by the House of Representatives.

At the Conference on Public Health Training held in August of 1963, the authoritative knowledge of 80 leaders in the fields of public health and public health training was focused on public health manpower problems. The conference measured the adequacy of the rate at which trained personnel are being developed by evaluating the staffing of health agencies over the past 10 years.

It is clear that the supply of trained health professionals is not keeping pace with population growth. It was also found that the present rate of training barely offsets attrition and program expansion, permitting little gain in providing more adequate training for the more than 20,000 inadequately trained personnel.

For example, in 1958, slightly less than half of all professional personnel in State and local health departments had received the training necessary to qualify them fully for their public health responsibilities. In 1963, 5 years later, only 51 percent were adequately trained. In addition, more than 5,000 budgeted positions are now vacant.

To maintain even the present inadequate staffing pattern in State and local health departments in relation to population growth and to offset attrition, at least 17,000 more trained workers must be produced by 1970. This legislation would permit a total of 8,500 individuals to receive full-time training in public health during the 5 years 1965-69.

Many more public health personnel will be needed by voluntary health agencies and Federal agencies, such as the Department of Health, Education, and

MORI/CDF

18542

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 12

Welfare, the Department of Defense, and other departments which have health responsibilities and international health programs.

An additional critically important basic need is to overcome the acute shortage of teachers, so that the faculties of the schools which must train these workers may be augmented.

They are vacant because personnel is not available in the United States with which to fill these positions.

H.R. 11083 would extend the existing program of public health traineeships for 5 additional years and extend for 4 additional years the existing program of project grants to schools of public health, schools of nursing, and schools of engineering, for public health training. Both programs would carry identical expiration dates of June 30, 1969.

H.R. 11083 also provides for a conference on public health training, to be called by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service between June 30 and December 1, 1967, with a report to the Congress by January 1, 1968.

The provisions of H.R. 11083 are based on the recommendations of the Second National Conference on Public Health Training, called by the Surgeon General in August 1963. Action along the lines recommended by the conference would significantly help increase the supply of critically needed professional public health manpower.

I ask unanimous consent that a table of the cost, 1965 to 1969, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cost, 1965-69  
(In thousands of dollars)

Item	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	Total
Public health traineeships...	4,500	7,000	8,000	10,000	10,000	39,500
Project grants...	2,500	4,000	5,000	7,000	9,000	27,500
Administration...	375	445	520	590	665	2,595
Total.....	7,375	11,445	13,520	17,590	19,665	69,595
Man-years of employment...	36	44	51	67	64	252

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in respect to this bill also, which has just been reported and placed on the calendar, time was allowed to members of the committee who might desire to file dissenting or additional views. I understand the bill has been cleared with Members who might have been interested in opposing the bill and that it is agreeable to them to have it considered at this time. That is why, as I said with respect to the previous nursing bill which was passed, I have joined the Senator from Alabama in allowing it to be brought up at this time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I want the Senate to know that I corroborate the statement of the distinguished Senator from New York. Members of the committee who might have wanted to file their own views were contacted. We were advised there was no desire to file minority or supplemental views and that it was satisfactory to have the bill brought up at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. So that those who read the RECORD may understand, this bill also covers nursing and nursing training, but nursing and nursing training with respect to public health needs and postgraduate training. It is training that is different from that encompassed in the bill passed previous to this bill.

Therefore, there is no duplication. These bills logically follow one after the other, public health being a branch of the professional science of both medicine and nursing which is not encompassed within either a doctor or a nursing bill unless it is expressly designed for public health purposes. It is well known and well understood to be an area of professional competence like surgery, for example, in which special postgraduate training is required. The purpose of the bill is to take up nursing in the public health field where the previous bill left off.

Mr. HILL. Yes; there is no conflict between the two bills, and no duplication. They are complementary one to the other.

Mr. JAVITS. There is a great deficiency in staffing public health and public health agencies. I believe the Senate would be well advised to pass this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JAVITS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### SAMPLE OF CORRESPONDENCE SUPPORTING THE OPPOSITION OF SENATOR MORSE TO THE SOUTH VIETNAM RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might have printed at this point in the RECORD a sampling of the correspondence that I have received in recent days in support of my opposition to the South Vietnam resolution. My mail is now running better than 200 to 1 in support of my position.

There being no objection, the sample of the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERKELEY, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Stand firm. Insist on debate and acceptance now 14-nation conference. Speak for whole country.

FRANCIS W. HERRING.

EUGENE, OREG.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

No war.

ROSEMARY FRAZIER.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

We fully support your courageous stand in opposition to U.S. intervention in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. NORMAN LEVINE.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge negotiations, not force, in settlement of Vietnam conflict.

Respectfully,

Dr. and Mrs. ZOLTON GROSS.

VAN NUYS, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Bring our destroyers and aircraft and all U.S. personnel home. Our Armed Forces have no business in Asia. We do not want war.

FRANCIS WRIGHT HUMANISES.

EUGENE, OREG.,  
August 5, 1964.

Hon. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

The following is a copy of a letter I am sending to President Johnson. "The time of concern for peace is past; the child was still-born. Let me be one of the first to descend from this current course of insanity. The policy of Senator WAYNE MORSE or the choice of President de Gaulle was far more sane. If you will—humane. Humane for those of Vietnam—North and South; humane for Americans; humane for the world." Needless to say, I shall support you and your past policy and hope that they will be the principles that guide you in your resolution today.

RAY E. JOHNSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

We support your position on Vietnam, a political solution not an armed one.

Mrs. RAVELISOLTES.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

We support your position on Vietnam, a political solution to problems not an armed solution.

JOANN PINTKOWSKI,  
JOAN TEMPLE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Support every effort of yours to secure immediate disengagement all U.S. forces from southeast Asia.

CARL KESSLER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

I support Senator MORSE's position on Vietnam, a political solution, not an armed one.

FRANK M. LESLIE.

1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18543

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

How can we a great Nation attack North Vietnam for provocations of unproved origin and afterward present the issue to U.N.? How can this decision be so urgent that we cannot first bring our charges to the U.N.?  
EARL BUDIN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly support your position against escalating the war in southeast Asia and urge you to continue your courageous fight to have the entire conflict submitted to the United Nations.

BETTY and MURRAY ABOWITZ.

BOSTON, MASS.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to not support American acts of aggression against innocent North Vietnamese.

ART SILBERGELD.

TACOMA, WASH.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

This is cruel, criminal, dishonest, stupid, and frightful. Please read that into the RECORD.

PAUL and YVONNE BRAUNE.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Events in Vietnam support your position. We can only lose lives and prestige as a democracy by carrying the war further. We should refer the issue to the United Nations.

WALTER PACKARD.

CHICAGO, ILL.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

American battleships off North Vietnam are provocation, endangering world. Such desperate brinkmanship characterizes rightist extremism.

Remove our ships from Tonkin Gulf.

Ask immediate U.N. support neutralization and withdrawal all foreign troops all Vietnam. Oppose military actions which would commit us to prosecution undeclared war. Prime responsibility yours.

S. GOLD FAMILY.

COLUMBIA, MO.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you continue to oppose our further involvement in southeast Asia war.

JOHN SCHUDER.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Oppose further involvement Vietnam. Get out instead of in. Negotiate through United Nations.

Sincerely,

Mrs. B. D. LAKE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Support your position. Political solution toward peaceful Vietnam neutralization to avert world war. Please act.

Mr. and Mrs. H. IRWIN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

I support Senator Morse's position on Vietnam. A political solution not an armed one.

LEE WINTNER.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,  
August 5, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly oppose any extension of U.S. commitment in southeast Asia.

Mr. and Mrs. CARL MOOS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge immediate withdrawal of war vessels cruising off Vietnam to avoid atomic war.

GERTRUDE GORDON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Our extreme and deliberate action against North Vietnam is an unwarranted escalation and serious threat to world peace.

Dr. and Mrs. CHARLES R. KLEEMAN.

NEWPORT, R.I.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Please maintain your magnificent independence. Tell public your analysis and do not rubber stamp war.

JESSIE LLOYD O'CONNOR LITTLE.

COMPTON, R.I.

CHICAGO, ILL.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Urgently hope you speak out against raising of war risk in southeast Asia.

DR. RICHARD FLACKS.

SEATTLE, WASH.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

A warminded President asks for a third world war. Please consult Senator GRUENING and other negatives and issue press statement at once.

ARTHUR C. DEWITT,  
U.S. Senate Candidate.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Please run as an independent for President. Voters need a choice on foreign policy.

THELMA SHUMAKE.

SALEM, OREG.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Enthusiastically support your opposition to military involvement in Vietnam.

PETER GRIFFIN.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work. Stop war Vietnam.

HAZEL M. LINTON.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations for your candor and courage in describing the character of American military action against North Vietnam.

H. JAMISON.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

Palo Alto, Calif.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
The Senate of the United States,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The news tonight that U.S. planes are bombing North Vietnam makes most distressingly apparent the need for a voice of reason with respect to our policy in southeast Asia generally and Vietnam in particular. In the past, yours has been the strongest voice—may I urge you to keep up the good work? To what can our present policy lead except the involvement of Communist China (another Korean war) and possibly the Soviet Union, and nuclear war. (North Vietnam has never been a threat to us; nobody, obviously, is interested in what happens to the Vietnamese, but world war III involves everybody on this planet.)

The United States has about as much business in Vietnam as the Soviet Union had in Cuba—is the American Government really less interested in peace than the Soviet Government?

Please urge our Government to call for a reconvening of the 1954 Geneva Conference, which provided for the only just and reasonable solution for southeast Asia—genuine neutrality.

ELIZABETH J. DRAKE.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., August 4, 1964.

DEAR SIR: I absolutely agree with you. We must end the unjust war in Vietnam. Please continue to use your influence to get American troops and "advisors" withdrawn from southeast Asia. They could be better used in Mississippi to enforce the Constitution.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID R. YALE.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,  
August 5, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please let your voice be heard clear and strong during this crisis. You have always been right on the situation in Vietnam, and it is important that you exert your influence for peace at this critical time.

I had hoped that President Johnson had more patience and tolerance. The petty attacks made upon our destroyers didn't justify our furious attack upon North Vietnam. It might not have been so bad if Vietnam had been warned in advance that if they persisted in their attacks, severe retribution would follow, but to make a



18514

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 12

major attack upon such slight provocation overflowed the measure. I fear that this attack will bring about a reconciliation between China and Russia and that they may present a united front. And I have no doubt whatever that we will be regarded as bullies all over the world and that we have alienated millions of friends. If I should invade the home of a neighbor whose children had played a few pranks and perpetrated a little mischief upon me, and beat up the children, that would be somewhat the equivalent of the attack we made on Vietnam.

I am grateful that you are in the Senate.  
Yours truly,

FRANZ JEVNE.

TACOMA, WASH.,  
August 4, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I write this appeal to you tonight. What has become of the American way when war is the national question—the great courageous debaters? Who says the American people consent to this frightful, cruel war in Vietnam which the President today unconstitutionally declared and acknowledged? I for one have had enough of killing, haven't you? And won't you please make it clear to the President.

Sincerely,

MARY W. BRANSCOMB.

STURGIS, S. DAK.,  
August 3, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I think you are performing a real service to the American people by your efforts to reduce the tremendous waste in foreign aid, and by pointing out our serious mistake in becoming involved in the Vietnam civil war. It seems to me that our State Department should have foreseen the impossibility of maintaining an anti-Communist government in South Vietnam, and in keeping Vietnam permanently divided into two hostile groups. There was certainly plenty of opportunity to promote a better understanding between the two factions and to encourage normal trade relations between them.

The sooner we get over the idea of dominating the world with military force and adopt a live-and-let-live policy, maintain our own institutions the way we like them, and allow all other countries to do the same, the better it will be for us and all other nations of the world.

I hope you will keep up your efforts until public opinion brings pressure on the administration to adopt a more reasonable policy.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE ALT.

AUGUST 4, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter I wrote to the President recently. I agree with you when you told the Secretary of Defense and General Taylor that "I am now convinced that the greatest threat to the peace of the world is the United States. I am convinced if the United States continues to follow the course of action implied (in your) briefing, we are headed for a major war in Asia, and we will be hated for the next 500 years by the overwhelming majority of mankind." You are so right.

What is wrong with President Johnson? Does he think this is the way to win an election, would he use these means to secure an election? It frightens me terribly, but what can one do. I shall send a telegram

to the President tonight but I'm sure it will be of no avail. Senator GEORGE Aiken said: He "has made up his mind to confront Red China . . . regardless of the costly results."

I hope you tell me what you think the most important action an average person can do in a situation of this kind. Whatever it is I shall get busy and see that a good many other people are made busy.

Sincerely,

ROSALEE GOODWIN.  
BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.

JULY 27, 1964.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
President of the United States,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am shocked and aghast to learn today that you have ordered more troops into Vietnam. Mr. President, what do you mean? It would seem you are deliberating leading us into a world war III, and I do not like it. And I am not alone in this feeling; many, many more Americans do not like it, and pretty soon they are going to be angry enough about this whole war situation, and fearful enough about it to see that you are defeated at the polls in November. I am lifelong Democrat but I cannot go along with you on this policy of brinkmanship. It seems an act to out-Goldwater Mr. GOLDWATER and that kind of policy is a bankrupt policy and is unworthy of a President of these United States. The CIA and the whole military-industrial complex has tried to inveigle every President to take a stand of this kind, but fortunately they have been too wise. But you, Mr. President, a Democrat, is succumbing to their line. I quote Max Freedman who analyzed the Johnson war moves in these terms: "Perhaps the whole effect is simply designed to prove that the Johnson administration can be as tough as Senator GOLDWATER. It had better watch itself or it will merely prove that it is more stupid than the Senator. Not even in his worst moments was John Foster Dulles ever guilty of such crude and reckless act of brinkmanship as the one into which the Johnson administration has now stumbled."

I cannot vote for a man for President on these terms, Mr. President. You talk peace and good will but meanwhile U.S. jets and "Laotian Air Force" T-28's (often piloted by CIA-hired Americans) continue to attack in Laos. The Laotians charged that "many innocent monks" were killed and wounded in an attack on temples in Xieng Khouang June 19 and that four peasants, including children, were killed in a raid on the villages. Senator WAYNE MORSE called these attacks "acts of war" for which the United States would be found guilty "by any international juridical tribunal." We shall be hated throughout the world for these "acts of war" and right we should be. Our hands are as bloody as the worst Nazi.

For God's sake, Mr. President, for the safety of the American people (another war and we die by the millions, too) as well as of the other people of the world, take this issue to the United Nations for settlement or agree to call another Geneva Conference where all interested parties can sit together and talk.

Yours truly,

R. K. GOODWIN.

DALLAS, TEX.,  
August 3, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your comment as underlined in the above news excerpt. I enclose the editorial because it is so indicative of the narrow parochial form of nationalism which is so typical of the Dallas Morning News. The publisher, E. M. (Ted) Dealey is the man who, early in the administration of the late President Ken-

nedy, stated at a luncheon where he and many other editors were the late President's guests, that what we need in the White House is a man who can ride horseback and not one who rides Caroline's tricycle. This juvenile comment went uncensored by Dallas and was highly praised as a heroic comment by the Dallas Morning News, of course. This man also makes an annual world tour and writes of his experiences and observations in various countries in such a manner that he evokes protests from citizens of those foreign nations. His comments are often offensive.

Does the United States have any right other than a power right in Asia? Does the Central Intelligence Agency, our State Department, and our Defense Department understand the oriental mind, the African mind, or even the European mind well enough to tell those countries how to manage their internal affairs? We certainly should let the United Nations handle South Vietnam. Secretary General Thant understands the situation better than we who fight for first one faction and then another.

Also, are we not attempting to pressure Latin American countries into helping us to starve the people of Cuba in the hope that they will become so desperate that they will kill their leader? Do we have any concern for the betterment of conditions for the masses in Cuba (many reports indicate that conditions would be better than formerly under Batista if United States did not place so many obstacles in the way of Castro, such as economic and diplomatic pressures)? Or, are we concerned only with getting back the vast property holdings and opportunities of our big industry which were appropriated by the Cuban Government?

Many of us see in the perpetuation of a war-gear economy for this Nation, a mere stalling of time until the day when we shall be forced by emphatic world opinion to convert our economy to one where our wealth, resources, manpower, and technology can be used toward the attainment of the maximum amount of welfare for all the peoples of the world.

Thank you for all your efforts toward lessening our armed interference in the affairs of other nations. Much progress has been made in the direction of world peace. We must not let the United States continue to place obstacles in the way of peace, now—not the sort of peace that is always dangled in front of us as a reward for fighting another war and causing more world destruction. The peace promised after war is illusory—peace is not obtained through war.

No reply is expected.

Respectfully,

EULA M. McNABB.

[From the Dallas Morning News, July 11, 1964]

## DRAWING THE LINE

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara went before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to answer charges of "brinkmanship" resulting from statements by top military leaders that the United States is ready to risk war to stop the Communists' take-over in South Vietnam. The Secretary pointed out the obvious fact that this country's effort to save South Vietnam does indeed carry "the risk of escalating to military actions outside the border of South Vietnam."

Any stand anywhere against the advance of an aggressor carries the risk of war. The President himself declared the other day that this country is prepared to take that risk to preserve freedom. And the most dangerous and direct threat to freedom today is in South Vietnam, an ally locked in combat with Communist military forces.

Senator WAYNE MORSE told the Senate that this country should stop "acting like an ag-

1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18545

gressor" and let the U.N. handle South Vietnam. "Red China is showing intentions of not being bluffed by the United States," he added.

The statement that the United States is "acting like an aggressor" by going to the aid of an ally under attack does not even deserve comment. But the answer to the observation that Red China may not be "bluffed" is that U.S. determination to maintain the independence of South Vietnam is not a bluff, nor should it be.

In warning the Red Chinese that this country is prepared to fight, if need be, American leaders can help to avoid any Red miscalculation over U.S. intentions to stand firm.

In 1950, ambiguous statements by the administration did not dispel the Communists' belief that the United States would not fight to save South Korea. They attacked and quickly found that they had misjudged this Nation's determination to stand by its friends. But by that time it was too late.

If making a clear stand carries with it the risk of war, appeasement and retreat carry an even bigger risk. For each concession only emboldens the aggressor and encourages him to try for more next time. Even if we were to step back again in Asia, eventually, somewhere we would have to draw the line beyond which the Reds could not cross without a fight.

Whether that line were drawn at Japan, Hawaii, or the Pacific coast, we would undoubtedly be at a bigger disadvantage than we are now.

The free world has twice before, in 1954 and 1962, given the Communists concessions in southeast Asia, in an attempt to buy them off. The only result has been to strengthen their forces and encourage their aggressive ambitions.

The soft-liners denounce the policy of firmness because they say it carries the risk of war. But the only policy which does not carry the risk of war is one of total and complete surrender. The free world detests and fears war but it is not ready to accept the notion that it is better to be Red than dead. If it ever reaches such a state of moral collapse, the result will be a new and more terrible dark age for all mankind. And that is not a risk, but a certainty.

SALEM, N.J.,  
August 4, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I should like to commend you for your stand on Vietnam. I wish more attention were being paid to your views and hope that, in future, more will be.

Respectfully,

FRANCES B. BOWEN.

AUGUST 5, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I urge you to keep up the good fight in the Senate and out, protesting this developing war in the Far East.

Quick on the heels of the large appropriations for the military, the provocations increase in Vietnam and now it looks like there are those who want to expand and extend the war to a hot war involving who knows how many nations.

I am writing the President protesting, and other Senators will also receive the same.

I cannot think of a more disastrous course for our Government to take.

Your speech the other day stating that if a war is declared that you would have to support it is very disturbing, to say the least. How can a bad thing be ever supported just because you are outnumbered in the vote? This involves the people of the whole world, not just the Senate of the United States.

Sincerely,

ESTHER EYER.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
August 5, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Having been abroad for some weeks, I have been unable to follow closely developments in Vietnam. However, I am appalled at the action announced by President Johnson last night.

I am writing to you, first to thank you for the stand you have taken on Vietnam, and to express my hope that you will continue to speak out, precisely at a time when rational discussion will be threatened by the emotions that are always released when shooting starts.

Very sincerely yours,

PAUL PEACHEY.

P.S.—My personal comments.—P.

JULY 30, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Rather than the presence of U.S. military forces in the South China Sea area and South Vietnam being a protection and a boon to the native population they are actually a risk to world peace, and it certainly seems an immediate conference should be initiated for settling the dispute with capable representatives of all nations involved participating.

This can be done within the framework of the United Nations, can it not?

Thank you.

Sincerely,

CECILIA CORR.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,  
July 31, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The whole country ought to be thankful—although I'm afraid the country doesn't hear as much about it as it should—for your penetrating comments on the mess in Vietnam, when we get for the most part a lot of blather, obfuscation and lies from Washington when anyone chooses to comment on our nasty little war there.

Have you any idea when we might be able to get out of this sale guerre? I think that General de Gaulle has some fruitful suggestions on this subject. After all, the French have been through it all before. Perhaps the Vietnamese might be given a chance to organize their own affairs—but not, I suppose, until after the Senator from Arizona is retired to private life in November.

I hope you are not discouraged by the relative isolation of your position. Within a year, most responsible people will be on your side, as many already are. It's always a pleasure to read your comments on affairs domestic or foreign, whenever the papers choose to print them. Keep up the good work.

M. H. WIXMAN.

AUGUST 4, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In the face of this new crisis precipitated by our country's illegal and immoral policy in southeast Asia, I realize anew the importance of your courageous fight. Please realize that you have my wholehearted support. I am sure there are many citizens, like me, who deplore the vile and outrageous stand of the past two administrations—meaning three—Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson—in violation of all international law. But there are not enough of us and we are too widely dispersed to make our stand weigh much against the madness that is sweeping our country. You seem to be our only voice. Keep up the fight.

Sincerely,

EDITH RASMUSSEN.

HIBBING, MINN.,  
August 4, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: As a subscriber to the Progressive your article, "Humpty Dumpty in Vietnam" in the Progressive August issue has been read.

It is splendid and very helpful. My letter to the Progressive has just been written urging the staff to make a good supply of copies of your article for distribution so that more people can be informed and be lead to write the Government in protest of what has been and is being done, and what perhaps it plans to do without consulting the public.

Sincerely,

MISS MARGARETTA REYNOLDS.  
CHICAGO, ILL.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Now that the situation in North Vietnam is escalating I am morally pressed to support your stand to solve our road to disaster by seeking nonmilitary means to our dilemma.

I anticipated this situation over a year ago but I thought our Government would also view the situation with the same sober analysis.

I cannot see supporting military dictatorships around the world that are no better than the enemy we seek to conquer whether in the East or Southern Hemisphere—or right in our own magnolia horrorland. Our money and lives are being wasted on despots that should have been vanquished by helping the populace that is now turning on us because of our play for power and not for humanity.

I'll terminate this communication now with my respects.

Mr. TONY MALLIN.

SEATTLE, WASH.,  
July 29, 1964.

The Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I have been following your speeches in the U.S. Senate re: "The War in South Vietnam." I heartily subscribe to the stand you have taken in this unfortunate conflict but why do you restrict yourself to making speeches about it instead of introducing a bill, or resolution, that the Congress of the United States is opposed to this undeclared war and ordering the Government to withdraw at once from South Vietnam and turn it over to the United Nations Assembly.

As you so correctly stated, the U.S. Congress never authorized this "war" although they must have known that under the defense appropriations certain sums had been earmarked for the action in South Vietnam. If the Congress doesn't know how much money is appropriated and for what purpose then they might as well go home and save the taxpayers all the millions they pay them for salaries, etc., etc.

In this connection I like to register my objection to the carte blanche issued to the CIA, when it comes to spending the people's money without having to give an accounting on it.

H.R. 11865, the Social Security Amendment of 1964, soon will be discussed on the floor of the Senate. The House version of this amendment is to allow a 5-percent increase in the payments of social security. Insofar as the consumer price-index for May 1964 shows an increase in the cost of living on all items of 109.1 over 1959 it shows scanty regard of the House Members for the needs of the people living on social security. I

18546

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 12

question the validity of those same Representatives to increase their own salaries by 33 percent while already drawing a very good salary and figuring that a social security recipient should be able to get by on a measly 5 percent increase, almost 5 percent below the consumer index prices at present.

When this matter comes up on the floor of the Senate, I request that the senior Senator from Oregon, will be one, among many, who will espouse the needs, not only of the social security recipients, but also that of the people living on State old-age benefits. They too should be included in an increase of their old age pensions.

If the U.S. Senate should increase the benefits to the social security recipients and those on old-age benefits to 10 percent we still will have no extra money left to pay for doctors or other medical care, reminding you that we look forward to the U.S. Senate to provide medicare for all the people living on social security and old-age benefits.

Sincerely yours,

EVERT VAN EE.

NEWBURGH, N.Y.,

August 5, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: How true it is that you are honorable. No propaganda or pressure groups can sway you from the right course. This letter is to inform you that you have one person in the public at large, who agrees with you wholeheartedly on your stand on Vietnam, etc. As always, you are on the right side of issues, see to the heart of the matter, are fearless and outspoken, and per usual, extremely intelligent. Your fellow Senators would do well to study carefully the book "A Nation of Sheep."

The immaturities, stupidities, and blindnesses of so many in public office are appalling and frightening in this day and age, to any thinking persons.

I dislike the arrogance of those who think this country can settle the present situation in the Far East—if the French could not, after years of useless bloodshed, certainly no other foreign nation can. Interference but exacerbates the trouble, and lends credence to the term "Western imperialists."

Have not troubled you with letters to read for a long time now, but thought a bit of approval might not be amiss at this time.

May the "tiger" growl, prowl, and claw for many years yet.

With deep respect and admiration.

Mrs. JOCELYN BOLGER.

P.S.—The question was rhetorical—you have no time to write letters. I shall endeavor to find this out for myself. Also, I never expect replies to my letters to you.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,

July 30, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Office of Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Merely a word to thank you for the July Progressive article on Vietnam. May I say how worthwhile and important it seems to me to be. If anything is of national moment just now then surely what you have written is. We have I think to get you to a "mike"—so that the Nation itself can be had by the ear. Otherwise how can it do—not having the information you have to impart—what you ask of it; viz, speak its mind to the authorities and tell these it knows what is going on and wants explanation—this to say the least.

I don't doubt but what you have tried to get your views broadcast and judging by results—if what I suppose is true—not much has come of the attempts. I have heard that where you are concerned the lid's clamped down and you haven't a chance. What Senator can be done about it? The Progressive

as you know reaches but few—in this case not enough by far. But how to do it. Thank you, Senator MORSE. Stay with it please. The people of this broad land must be given a chance to hear you.

GEORGE FRANKLIN.

DENVER, COLO.,

July 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to congratulate you on your courageous stand against the war in South Vietnam. I commend you also for pointing out that our allies in Europe are not in favor of extending this war into North Vietnam.

My best wishes to you in gaining further support of your position.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. ANNE K. ROBBETT.

BALTIMORE, MD.,

August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations from us, and from friends we have spoken to, on your firm and reasoned stand for peace and negotiations on tonight's interview, in re Vietnam, and the proposed congressional resolution.

We sincerely hope our Senators and Congressmen will also refuse to be stampeded and vote "No" to committing Congress to a blank check to anyone else to declare war.

Thanks on behalf of all who stand for peaceful negotiation—because "brush wars" can lead to world war III and nuclear annihilation.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. HELEN SCHMERLER.  
SAM SCHMERLER.

PARIS, July 18, 1964.

Senator MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As many other French people I have read your extremely courageous words condemning the pursuit of war in Vietnam. I have also learned with great admiration that you recently added: "I believe it a scandal that military men be let loose in the field of foreign policy." (Translated from the French press.)

Indeed, it is words of this very kind we expect from your great country, and it is such words that make it dear to us. How sad it is to think that quite often the Pentagon obey neither the directions of the President nor those of Congress. Energetic attitudes such as yours should be able to cope with this danger.

Allow me to send you an issue of my publication L'Année Politique et Economique in which I expressed briefly how deeply I had admired the statement you made in February. I shall keep on praising your brave stand.

Believe me yours most sincerely,

BERNARD LAVAGNE,  
Honorary Professor of the Faculty of  
Law of the University of Paris.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

August 5, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I am dismayed by your action in ordering planes to attack North Vietnam. It appears to me that this is an issue which should be settled by the United Nations rather than ordering our military forces into action. This is what the United Nations was created for.

It seems to me that the attack on our ships by torpedo boats may have come from General Khanh—from South Vietnam—in order to provoke action by our country against North Vietnam. It appears inconceivable that Hanoi would attack U.S. warships without provocation knowing the possibility of retaliation. The correct procedure would have been to investigate first and have the matter thrashed out in the United Nations.

I trust that you will go slowly with any further moves which will expand the war into perhaps a conflict with China and conceivably the Soviet Union. Acting impulsively in matters which may affect the future of the entire world seems to be more of the type of action advocated by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, who is known for his disposition to "shoot from the hip."

Respectfully yours,

ALEXANDER SMITH.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,

July 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you so very much for your report of July 21 and copy of your views on Foreign Assistance Act of 1964. Even the ordinary layman can understand the reasonableness and justice of your position. When I have read this again, I am turning it over to a friend who admires the position you have taken on this issue and almost every other one that comes before the Senate.

Thanks again and all good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

ETHEL COHEN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

July 29, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your article, "Humpty Dumpty in Vietnam," should be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and copies made available to the public.

However, Philippe DeVillers stated definitely that the fighting was not started from outside of South Vietnam but from the grassroots where the people were literally driven to defend themselves against Diem's repressions.

Your efforts to end the war in Vietnam are deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

THOMAS AMMERS.

MACOMB, ILL.,

July 30, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just finished reading your article on Vietnam in the latest issue of the Progressive. I simply want to tell you that your article is one of the best essays on the subject that I have read; I agree with you almost completely. For many months now I have followed your statements and public announcements on this subject, and I have appreciated what you have been trying to do. It appears that you have little support in either the Senate or the House.

Agreement from a resident of the State of Illinois does little to help you; unfortunately, I am unable to vote for you. I do feel that both Senators and Congressmen should represent their Nation as well as their personal constituents, and in this area I believe that you do a better job for Illinois than the Senators we have in Washington. In short, there are people in the country who appreciate your statements on this complex and sad, as well as extremely dangerous, situation in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. BURTON.



1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18547

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,

July 28, 1964.

U.S. President JOHNSON, Senators MORSE, GRUENING and ELLENDER.

HONORED GENTLEMEN AND SIR: Before me is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated March 4, 1964, text of Senator MORSE's Senate speech opposing U.S. intervention in Vietnam; and I am appealing hereon to you, Honorable President, on the position of our able and foresighted Senator, Mr. MORSE.

I raise my points as follows: (a) masking of foreign aid, as such, and using it military intervention to the destruction of a peace-desiring population, and costing U.S. taxpayers, already overburdened by taxes, millions of dollars per day; and

(b) Comparing Vietnam and its proximity to Mississippi and the anarchy there, I urge you to bring the 15,000 troops from Vietnam and send them to Mississippi. When Supreme Justice, Senator JAVITS and other men of integrity, decry the overdue use of safety measures in Mississippi; when ample evidence of killing and burning of churches, bombings and denials of personal rights and safety of peoples who defy the K.K.K. and other like groups, I wonder if our democracy is real or only a camouflage for vested interests.

Further, articles and sections of the U.N. Charter to which our United States is a signatory, strictly forbid our or any signer, from military intervention, but specifies:

"Section 4: All members shall refrain from threat or use of force.

"Article 2, section 3: all members shall settle disputes by peaceful means, so \* \* \*.

"Article 33, section 1: the parties to any dispute shall seek solutions in 'every way but war.'"

Yet McNamara goes forward planning ever use of troops, weapons, money—in greater amount, greater scope and with greater destruction to natives of Indochina, just as J. F. Dulles did in Korea; to the detriment of the U.N. and U.S. taxpayers and to great profit of big U.S. business.

Appreciating the crying need of our aged and venerated parents for adequate food, clothing, shelter and medical aid; for millions of idle adults and hungry children; for the drastic need of more schools and teachers, hospitals, better wage levels for employees in schools, hospitals, and other public employees, would it not be far better to use 90 percent of cold war costs for social betterment of our national well-being than to follow the Eisenhower-Dulles, Rusk-McNamara trail downward to greater and costlier wars?

The Scandinavian States have not been in war during this century. Though far poorer than this wealthy state, far better education is provided for their every babe at birth than it is in the United States. Why?

Honorable President, I implore you to pull back our Nation from another Korea or any war, before it is too late. Repudiate the poor advice of those who cry "I am a Christian" yet lust for bloodshed, dominance and worldwide power. Lend your ear, your decency and good office to the only goal of humanity—that of peace, plenty and good will, so future men will speak of our land, our peoples as being the savior of future man from the scourge of war, hunger and unemployment.

Nuclear war respects no one. I ask you "remove every man from responsibility who favors war and using nuclear bombs; bring all troops home, except those doing U.N. duty as real preservers of the peace—not as protectors to foreign investments. Let us be our neighbors keeper, not his jailor.

Very respectfully yours,

JOE BIRD.

Please send 10 or more copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, your speech of March 4,

No. 157—10

1964, on the Vietnam situation, and please put on your regular mailing list:

Laur Bird, 916 South 2d Avenue, Olympia, Wash.

Cal Carlson, 150 Burton Avenue, Salt Lake, Utah.

George Roberts, 544 Denver Street, Salt Lake, Utah.

Roger Wilson, 1545 West Russett Avenue, Salt Lake, Utah.

C. Wayman, 1570 West Russett Avenue, Salt Lake, Utah.

Twan Hansen, 722 No. 2d West, Salt Lake, Utah.

Parley D. Bird, Jr., 417 Blair Street, Salt Lake, Utah.

Down with GOLDWATER, Utah's Birchite-Mormons, ad nauseam.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

August 5, 1964.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Thank you for your stand for withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam, that terrible war where we should never have even been.

MISS PEARL A. LaFORCE.

NEW ERA CIVIC ASSOCIATION,

Ecorse, Mich., July 14, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,

U.S. Senate,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Living as we do in the century of nuclear arms, it becomes our responsibility to call a halt to all wars that may lead to the destruction of all humanity. It is for this reason that this letter is being written. Your campaign in the Senate of the United States to recall U.S. troops from Vietnam serves this purpose and is therefore in the best national interests of our Nation.

It is also desirable that a peaceful settlement be negotiated to settle all outstanding issues in southeast Asia and that this came about as a result of a gathering of all Nations interested in peace, together with the United Nations.

I sincerely hope that you will do all in your power to effect such conference.

Respectfully yours,

ETHEL V. STEVENSON,

President.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

July 30, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you for your courageous and honorable stand in the Halls of Congress with regard to our country's policy in Vietnam. Your voice rings out significantly as it finds its echo in the hearts of all peace-loving Americans.

Since both President Johnson and Senator GOLDWATER have indicated that foreign policy will be the major issue of the 1964 political campaign, I cannot to myself overestimate the valuable contribution you are making to the political dialog over the question of disposition of South Vietnam. I read daily with dismay the tragic happenings there. I believe that South Vietnam should be neutralized and not made the basis for a hot war. Please continue to fight and champion the cause of peace; the peoples of southeast Asia have suffered much from other countries trying to liberate them and keep them part of the free world.

I am not one of your constituents, although I lived in Oregon for several months while attending the University of Oregon. My stay in Oregon was a most happy one, and I always consider Oregon as one of our very finest States.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Miss C. PILANI LUM.

LYNN, MASS.,

Washington, D.C., August 5, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support your stand on South Vietnam. I wish you success. I feel the war should be ended.

Thank you.

SOPHIE W. GASS

Mrs. Nathan Gass.

SEATTLE, WASH.,

August 4, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You deserve the heartfelt thanks of every right thinking American for your wise and courageous yet, so far, ineffective opposition to our hopeless but extremely costly campaign in South Vietnam.

Johnson, Rusk, McNamara, Taylor, et al., assure us that "victory" in South Vietnam is just around the corner. What utter folly. This South Vietnam affair is what the police might call an outside job. It is inspired, supplied, and directed from outside. Even if it were possible to kill every Communist guerrilla in South Vietnam, North Vietnam has 16 million people to replace them.

Besides, South Vietnam is not a unified nation. There are several million Roman Catholics, a relic of French occupation, but the bulk of the people are Buddhists, with far closer cultural ties with North Vietnam than with the United States, or with their Catholic brethren in South Vietnam.

After all the hundreds of millions of dollars we have spent in South Vietnam, if we were to remove our forces the present regime would not last 3 months. (In fact the very regime we interfered to uphold collapsed right in our faces.) Are we prepared to garrison South Vietnam the next hundred years to insure a non-Communist regime there?

Red China has 700 million people and South Vietnam around 14 million. Even if the Communists took over in South Vietnam it would only increase the Communist population of east Asia by 2 percent. How many billions of dollars and how many hundreds if not thousands of American lives are we prepared to sacrifice to reduce the Communist population of east Asia by 2 percent?

North Vietnam has been Communist for 10 years with no traceable injury to the United States. Why deceive ourselves into thinking that a reunion of Vietnam would be disastrous to the United States; when that reunion would save us billions of dollars and hundreds if not thousands of American lives, without the slightest injury to the 190 million Americans in North America?

Sincerely yours,

B. L. MCCULLOUGH.

HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT, MICHIGAN COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, SAULT BRANCH,

Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., August 3, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,

U.S. Senate,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My most hearty sympathy and support to you upon your frank statements on the floor of the Senate, and press interviews on the southeast Asia and Vietnam situation. Keep up the good work.

MILTON E. SCHERER.

P.S.—I'm a Demo, too.

TULSA, OKLA.,

August 3, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We want to thank you for the stand that you are taking in regard to the war in Vietnam and for the stand you are taking in reference to foreign aid. The

18548

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 12

American people are sick and tired of our foreign policy with a no-win attitude and our coexistence with Russia who calls all the shots and we follow instead of lead. I just read where Supreme Court Justice Douglas states that foreign aid is simply widening the gap between the poor and the rulers of the various countries getting our money. Why don't we attend to our own business instead of telling the world how they should run their business. We are at war in Vietnam and no war has been declared. How long can our country survive with such an insane policy?

Keep on fighting and thanks again for what you are trying to do.

Yours very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. HARRY SCHWARTZ.

TOPEKA, KANS.,  
August 3, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senator from Oregon,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

MR. DEAR SENATOR: I have just finished reading your forthright article in the Progressive. Thank goodness someone has the courage to raise his voice against our absurd policy in southeast Asia. Keep up the good fight and I certainly hope you will be able to influence our future course of action in this troubled area of the world.

It is good to know there are a few brave men and true, in the Senate of the United States, who have the courage of their convictions.

Carry on.

Sincerely,

JUSTIN W. HILLYER.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,  
August 4, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

HON. SENATOR MORSE: May we the thousands of avowed Democrats at Ebbets Field Housing commend you on your profound article in August Progressive. May we implore you to personally show it to the President, Secretary of State and Defense, and also read it loud and clear in the Senate.

Respectfully yours,

RENE STUART.

JULY 31, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I thought you might be interested in the enclosed piece of fan literature. I too approve of your position on South Vietnam, though I am not sure I agree with it completely. I think it is a remarkable tribute to your own acumen that you have succeeded in stating your mind on a wide variety of controversial issues while remaining in sure political power, a trick which is usually reserved for Justices of the Supreme Court. And as an apostil I wish to make it clear that I am not now and never have been a member of the Communist Party, although I am sure that if anyone from Tocsin reads this letter I will be an "identified Communist" soon enough.

Respectfully,

ROBERT CHRISTGAU.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,  
August 3, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please keep exerting all the pressure you can for military withdrawal from Vietnam. General Khanh is not the people's choice. I am tired of the oversimplified answer that we must stop Red aggression and that is the reason we are there. We are stopping the peaceful unification of the Vietnamese. I believe 80 percent of the people can't read or write so what do

they know of social theories of government? They can see their people being killed. Are we going to have another Korea and after 2,000 or 3,000 are killed end up with a permanently divided country?

My wife and I met you at a garden party in Long Beach about 6 years ago.

Sincerely,

LEONARD L. SHENKAN.

AUGUST 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are so right in regard to our involvement in other countries. We do not make peace by promoting wars. We applauded your speech—your effective phrase: "What kind of hypocrites are we," is still ringing in our ears. We also approved your very fine article in the August Progressive. Would that we had more statesmen in Washington like Senator MORSE and Senator FULBRIGHT.

Mr. and Mrs. GORDON SANDERS.  
CLEARWATER, FLA.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF.,  
July 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: I have written to a member of my State's delegation the following letter:

"I have read, almost in entirety, Senator WAYNE MORSE's speeches to the Senate regarding the above. No Senator was able to answer him. Only Senator COOPER even made a serious effort. It is easy to see why: Senator MORSE had the facts, and the facts were proof positive that we were waging aggressive war against the Vietnamese people.

"What was not brought out sufficiently were the reasons that Diem and his successors are unable to marshal even a corporal's guard of Vietnamese to defend the regime.

"For decades, even centuries, the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America have been victims of a worldwide economy which has condemned a vast majority of the world's inhabitants to being hewers of wood and carters of water to a few powerful industrial nations. Most of the former were colonies of European powers. Others, such as China, were happy hunting grounds for several predatory states, each with more or less recognized spheres of influence.

"Similarly, the Latin American countries were complete economic vassals to the United States and certain European states.

"Today there are relatively few absolute colonies left in the world. Native revolt and political opposition in the mother countries forced the United States, Britain, France, and Belgium to turn loose their vassals in the Philippines, India, Africa, etc. However, this independence is by no means complete. Not only are a large part of the undeveloped countries saturated with foreign private capital, but French Armies remain in Africa, British troops occupy Malaysia.

"We occupy Taiwan and our fleet regulates the Formosa Straits, the South China Sea and now the Indian Ocean.

"Nearer to home, I was told by a high government official in Mexico that no move made by his nation is without consideration of the reaction of the colossus of the north in mind.

"Indochina was the richest plum in the French cake. The ratio of trade between imperialist France and its southeast Asian possessions was four to one in favor of the former. Fifty percent of the exports of these colonies went to France, which in turn accounted for 75 percent of their imports. Principal exports were rubber, rice and spices. Major imports were textiles, machinery and wines and liquors, in that order. In other words, raw materials out, manufactured goods in.

"An interesting sidelight: The second most important export, rice, equaled in value the second most important import, machinery, but the tonnage was 12 times greater.

"In his book concerning the decline of colonialism in the world 'The Last Illusion,' Herschel D. Meyer has this to say:

"Vietnam came under the rule of the French Bank of Indochina in 1889. It began its operations with two million francs, which had swelled to 10 billion in 1948, besides the billions it paid out in dividends. Its annual report of June 11, 1948, said that its 1947 opium and alcohol sales netted a billion francs in profits. The Bank of Indochina laws in Vietnam require of each police prefect that 6,200 liters of brandy be consumed monthly in his area, or seven liters per inhabitant per month. Penalties are meted out to villages which consume less."

"It was against this intolerable situation that revolts took place in Vietnam and Cambodia almost throughout the period of French rule. From 1859 to 1861, Annam was in revolt. From 1873 to 1883 there was constant civil war in Tonkin. Cambodia revolted in 1885. The natives were crushed by overwhelming French power.

"The events of the Second World War pointed up the political astuteness of the Vietnamese people. Vichy France gave the Japanese the right of occupation on Tonkin bases for use against the Chinese. However, these traitors figured without the Vietnamese people, who gave the Japs no respite. With arms supplied by the British, they carried on constant guerrilla warfare, finally forcing the enemy to withdraw.

"At the end of the war, the nationalist government of Ho Chi Minh controlled all Vietnam. The British and Chinese who were given occupation rights under the Potsdam Agreement landed only token forces. France made an ambiguous statement recognizing Vietnamese freedom within the French union.

"It was while negotiations were proceeding regarding the meaning of this independence that Gen. Jacques Laclec landed troops at Haiphong to begin the Indochinese war of 1946-54.

"The whole world knows how decisively the French were defeated. They never controlled anything but the big cities and finally were clobbered when the stupid French generals allowed their best forces to be trapped at Dienbienphu, far from possible help from the Hanoi-Haiphong base.

"At the Geneva Conference of 1954, the French were allowed to save face by occupying the southern half of the country until elections could be held in 1956.

"The Vietnamese figured without Dulles, not to mention McNamara. They did not realize that whereas France had had it, we were willing to continue the war down to the last Vietnamese.

"From this point WAYNE MORSE takes on very well indeed.

"Let the dark-skinned people of the Asian nations settle their own internal problems in their own way.

"There is enough for decent Americans to do in their own backyard.

"Forces must be mustered to defeat the Yahoos of American politics, who want to return lynch law to the South and starvation to the rejects of American industry who inhabit our slums.

"There is the problem of decent housing for millions in our big cities. (Did you chance to read Michael Harrington's 'The Other America: Poverty in the U.S.A.'?)

"One more thing before I close. I recently had occasion to visit a migratory labor camp in Tulare County. The conditions of life of the people who harvest our agricultural products is beyond description. At any rate, you should see for yourself.



1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18549

"I pray that you will shortly join Senator Morse in his noble fight to stop the slaughter in Vietnam.

"With kindest regards,  
"Yours truly,

"CONRAD EDISES."

References: Chinese Quarterly, January-March 1962, "The Struggle for Unification of Vietnam," by Philippe Devillers; Encyclopedia Britannica, 1958 edition, "Indochina"; "The Last Illusion," by Hershel D. Meyer, Anvli-Atlas Publishing, New York, 1954; "The Other Side of the River," by Edgar Snow Random House, New York, 1962; plus all of Senator WAYNE MORSE's speeches to the Senate on the subject, 1964.

ALBION, MICH.,  
August 3, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senator from Oregon,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am deeply disturbed over the latest report from Vietnam. Since we cannot possibly win, we had better pull out before it is too late.

If we do not pull out, we may wake up to find that Red China has poured a million men into Vietnam that could cause a war that could set the world afire.

Please speak out again (as you have in the past) against this stupid war in Vietnam. Johnson must not allow BARRY GOLDWATER to scare him into doing something desperate.

Cordially yours,

ARTHUR W. MUNK.

SENATOR MORSE: Just finished reading "Humpty Dumpty in Vietnam"—it is excellent and deserves greater distribution. Do keep up the good work.

E. R. WELLS.

LINDEN, MICH.  
Are reprints available?

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,  
August 3, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Foreign Relations Committee.

DEAR SIR: I urge you to intensify your criticism of our unconscionable policy in Vietnam. We are obviously unwelcome there by the population, and a policy of military resolution will only increase their suffering and make us more despicable in the eyes of Asians. Moreover, any attempt by our military, or theirs, to take the decisions in that struggle out of the hands of the duly constituted authorities, will undoubtedly result in a great deal of damage to the United States, even as far as its domestic politics is concerned.

Yours truly,

FRANK TURAJ,  
Department of English.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,  
August 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon.

DEAR SIR: In the a.m. news and radio is more of the horrors our sons and grandsons are in, in Vietnam. I heard your remark about war. I couldn't agree with you more. I will never know who could sleep at all knowing he has sent our children and grandsons to a place like that and then the nerve to call 16,000 men, all sent for advisers. How stupid does any one think we the voters are. Those people over there will drag as long as America gives them money and our sons and grandsons are feeding their war machine. Who has the authority to send our children to their death when our country leaders would not allow a victory in Korea and MacArthur could of won. Since he was not allowed to win, we broke our own back, all the world see us as no winning nation now. We lost all world respect in Korea. Our men should be sent home from Saigon. We can use all of them at home. We have our borders to guard and forests to

guard, our shorelines to guard, our highways to guard. We can use them in many, many ways to keep them in a good trained condition. They could help in Alaska, to develop our State there and God only knows where something will strike our Nation and our men are needed over here. We are not deaf and dumb and blind. Not all of us. I have been all along the road from 1895 down to now and I can see how things have drifted. Where are the Americans like my granddad who raised me and they had strong steady principles. He went to the Civil War to prove it from his homestead in Michigan. Left his wife and nine children to run the farm and he went. Came back a cripple. But they won and that was what he went for.

Our sons and grandsons just have to come back to our own Nation, there is not even any glory in our children being killed in a mess like Vietnam or any common horse-sense either, so why send them there to die for nothing at all. What man can find in his heart and mind authority to send our boys to their death?

Mrs. ORAH MAE TACKETT,  
A grandmother of servicemen.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,  
July 27, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want to express our agreement with your position on Vietnam, i.e., that the administration must end our participation in the civil war in Vietnam and that a nonmilitary solution must be found. We realize that today, this may not be a very popular position, and we congratulate you for speaking up and taking this stand. We hope you will continue to work for an end to our part in this war and a solution to the crisis in an international agreement that might include demilitarization and neutralization under international guarantees, of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam.

Very truly yours,

Dr. and Mrs. STEPHEN L. TALLER.

JULY 31, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am certainly glad that there is at least one person in Washington who is sane; namely, yourself. I refer to your statements regarding the dangers of U.S. involvement in South Vietnam.

My personal feelings on the matter which derive, from a purely humanitarian approach, are contained in the enclosed copy of a letter I sent to President Johnson, with a copy to the State Department. I never heard from the President but received from the State Department excerpts from a speech made by the President declaring his intention to press for military victory.

Very few people seem to realize that we are living on the brink of total disaster or if they do realize it they try to treat it as something of no serious consequence. You apparently are a realist and a very brave man to be at odds with the majority of your peers.

If there is anything I can do to help in getting local support of your efforts to bring about a speedy and peaceful solution to the Vietnam debacle, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mrs. KATHLEEN TURITTO.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.

KIMBERTON, PA.,  
August 3, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want to convey our appreciation for your stand in the Senate against our gradually spreading war in

Vietnam and against the warminded people in high places who seem to be pressing for a new U.S. colonialism in southeast Asia even at the risk of war with China.

We strongly support your opposition to these threats to liberal government and emerging democratic procedures the world over. We urge you to continue that opposition and to make every effort to bring this matter to the attention of the American people through the mass media and personal contact.

With best wishes for success in this critically important undertaking,

Sincerely,

RICHARD JOHN STANEWICK.  
PHYLLIS STANEWICK.

JULY 31, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I want to express my deep appreciation of your stand on the fighting in Vietnam. One can always count on the sincerity which you bring to your office, and the wisdom with which you approach national problems and problems of international scope.

Many thanks for speaking out against policies which are not only fraught with danger to ourselves but to the rest of the world as well.

Best wishes to you and yours.

Mrs. LILLIAN C. MARKS.  
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

FALLS CHURCH, VA.

Hon. Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We agree wholeheartedly with your views on South Vietnam. The Russians, French, and Chinese are pointing a finger at us so the rest of the world can see what fools we are making of ourselves. You are a sophisticated foreign politician. You and FULBRIGHT are tops at international insight. True pioneers stick by your principles regardless of outcome. Bravo. You boys practice what others preach. Now I know why the people of Oregon send you back to Washington, D.C. all the time, we'd be lost without men like you. (Too few.)

JON DORIAN.

TACOMA, WASH.  
August 4, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your brief but powerful condemnation of our activity in Vietnam contrary to all law. It covered this area via ABC radio network strong and clear Sunday morning and again this morning. I hope you and the other Senators continue.

REX S. BOUBEUSH.

HAMILTON, OHIO,  
August 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my congratulations for your very fine article in the Progressive, "Humpty-Dumpty in Vietnam." I should also like to express my very strong agreement with your other statements on the same subject.

It seems to be generally agreed that any regard for sanity, logic, or international law is indecent, if not downright subversive, if our policy in Vietnam is being discussed. In spite of this, I hope that you keep trying. I consider it a national disgrace that your comments are getting so little support, and such meager publicity—and that the facts of the situation are being so resolutely ignored.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM TAYLOR.

18550

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 12

TAMPA, FLA.,  
July 25, 1964.Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is my understanding that on June 26 you inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the third time, more than 15 pages of letters which you received opposing U.S. policy in southeast Asia.

I would very much like to receive a copy of this particular issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and if you have this available I would appreciate your sending me one.

For your information, on the Vietnam issue you have my full support. I firmly believe that we have no business in Vietnam and that the sooner we get out of there the better for all concerned.

Cordially yours,

Mrs. JOHN RODRIGUEZ.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,  
July 29, 1964.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senator,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Attached is a copy of an article entitled "What the Vietcong Wants," which appeared in the Economist, July 25, 1964, "International Report." I see the paper carried the report that 5,000 more boys will be sent to Vietnam to teach their people how to fight. The rate, at which they are dying, indicates something else. Who is trying to save face?

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. HORN.

More dead men yesterday. Who is promoting the slaughter and for what?

## VIETNAM: WHAT THE VIETCONG WANTS

Apart from a spectacular rebel victory at Cai Be that killed a good many wives and children of government troops, the 10th anniversary on Monday of the Geneva agreements on Indochina was enlivened by a vigorous Communist diplomatic offensive against the Saigon government. The Government of North Vietnam has restated its views on how to solve the struggle in the south; more interestingly, the Paris newspaper, Le Monde, reprinted an interview given to the Communist journalist Wildred Burchett by Nguyen Huu Tho, president of the South Vietnamese National Liberation Front, the political organization of the Vietcong.

A clear perspective of Communist solutions for Vietnam is now available. A comparison of the two views demonstrates some interesting nuances of difference between Hanoi—the capital of North Vietnam—and the Vietcong, though these, like the Liberation Front's insistence that it is independent of the north, may be more tactical than real. Both sources base their solutions on implementation of the 1954 Geneva agreements, and both assert (incorrectly) that the United States and the Saigon government are the only authorities breaking them.

The North Vietnamese solution is that America must respect the "sovereignty, independence, unity, and territorial integrity of Vietnam" while the "South Vietnam administration" gets rid of foreign troops; then "the South Vietnamese people themselves would settle South Vietnam's internal affairs in accordance with the plan of the Liberation Front" including a foreign policy of "peace and neutrality." Finally, the reunification of Vietnam is "the affair of the Vietnamese people," to be settled "in the spirit of the respective programs" of Hanoi and the Liberation Front.

Clearly Hanoi envisages reunification as a relatively long-term affair. The Liberation Front has been even more specific, and in one respect it goes less far than the North Vietnamese. Mr. Nguyen Huu Tho told his

interviewer that his organization did not claim a monopoly in the formation of a new South Vietnamese government; it would be ready to ally itself with any group that accepted the basic principles "peace, independence, democracy, and neutrality," even if there were differences on other points. The Liberation Front (which is not entirely Communist itself) presumably envisages a government that would include non-Communist elements. It might come to the top through a new coup d'état in Saigon; it is not banking on such a coup, but thinks it possible.

As for reunification, the resultant "authorities" would negotiate with the north step by step, taking account of the differences between the two "zones." As a first step, the two zones should reestablish economic, postal, and cultural ties, and allow families to visit each other across the border.

In the meantime, the Liberation Front supports the idea of a neutral zone in southeast Asia, including Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam. This accords with the fairly clear rejection by the North Vietnamese of the inclusion of their country in President de Gaulle's proposed neutralization. In the long term, a reunified Vietnam would presumably call itself neutral—if Hanoi is sincere in talking about the Geneva agreements—but it would be a Communist neutrality. Both the Liberation Front and Hanoi understand neutrality in the strictly military sense of the word.

CANANDAIGUA, N.Y.,  
July 28, 1964.Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations for courageously speaking forth against the military buildup in Vietnam and the dangerous consequences of such a policy by our Government. I agree that there can be no winning of this kind of war, and that our present policy may escalate into something that no one would want—even China and North Vietnam—who might feel forced by rash U.S. actions was necessary.

The more weapons we send to Vietnam, the more modern weapons the guerrillas will capture to help them continue their cruelties. Most of the weapons sent, from us, are therefore a mixed blessing only to the Vietnamese who fight with us.

If you and others can put pressure on our Government to stop wasting our money in this fashion, and to make a big, sincere effort to influence other countries in cooperating toward neutralizing the area, we will find our prestige in the eyes of the neutral and underdeveloped countries, as well as Russia, France (with her long, sad experience in southeast Asia before us) and other countries will be increased. And I should think that the South Vietnamese people would fight harder with us if they knew there was a goal—the possibility of peace—before they are annihilated or decide to join the Communists.

Best wishes in making your voice heard. GOLDWATER must not drown you out.

Yours very sincerely,

Mrs. WALTER GRUEN.

GREELEY, COLO.,  
July 28, 1964.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In a time when foreign policy has become nondebatable, your opposition to the stance of the United States in southeast Asia is not only heartening, but courageous as well. I feel that you and those Senators with you who have questioned our war in Vietnam have acted in the very best interests of the United States. You do indeed represent me in your fight for a sane policy in southeast Asia. I feel that a siz-

able number of U.S. citizens share our discontent with that policy.

I earnestly hope that you will continue your efforts to expose the war in Vietnam for what it is: a cruel, inhuman interference in the internal conflict of a nation. The United States can only suffer from the continuation or extension of our Government's present warlike attitude.

Very sincerely,

MARY HELEN WILLOUGHBY.

VENICE, CALIF.,  
July 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: The war in South Vietnam has reached a crucial point. U.S. policy to extend the war to North Vietnam, Laos, and China will escalate the war to nuclear proportions which means world disaster. It is not too late to change that course. Your voice has been the loudest on the Senate floor in favor of political negotiations instead of a shooting war. I implore you to continue to speak up as your voice carries weight to influence many of your colleagues in the Senate. Wish there were many more like you.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. F. MELOMEDOW.

IRVINGTON, N.J.,  
July 28, 1964.Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Good luck in your campaign to pull our troops out of Vietnam. I hope you succeed in educating the Senate as to the hopelessness of our cause in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

JUDITH DE LEON  
Mrs. Sanford D. De Leon.STRATFORD, N.J.,  
July 29, 1964.

SENATOR MORSE: I never had the occasion to meet you. But I have read many of your speeches you made on the floor of the Senate and I, as well as you, don't believe Vietnam is worth 1 ounce of American boy's blood to be shed for the international banker. I believe Asia is for the Asian people. We should defend our homeland as England and France defends theirs. If they love their country let the youth of that country show it by training themselves to defend their own homeland they love so much. God bless you and keep you well. Why don't you toss your hat in the ring for President and run on these principles? You have rights, Senator.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. THOMAS A. MCGOWAN.

P.S.—You at least get my vote. There is one already to start you off. A winner never quits and a quitter never wins.

FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH,  
Miami, Fla., July 20, 1964.Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Social Issues Committee of the First Unitarian Church of Miami wishes to thank you for your attempts to obtain factual and complete accounts of the U.S. involvement in the conflicts of southeast Asia.

We feel that your questioning and critical approach to the Asian problem is a healthy attitude which must be encouraged. It is unfortunate that so few of your colleagues have been willing to speak out, as you have done, on this particular problem. In a true democracy, no policy or tactic can be so sacred as to be beyond question.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM G. BELL,  
Chairman of the Social Issues Committee.

1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18551

NEWARK, DEL.,  
July 27, 1964.

Re Vietnam.

Hon. Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am deeply concerned about our continuing involvement in South Vietnam.

Having been in Korea 1951-52 and being involved in that fruitless and pointless affair I can see a similar futility in South Vietnam.

We are not winning. We are not even doing better and the shocking news in today's Philadelphia Inquirer of 5,000 more Americans going there is most shocking. This brings our personnel involvement to 21,000—18,000 at present and 5,000 on way.

Please know that I support fully your position in this regard. I have written to President Johnson and to Senator Boggs of Delaware on this matter.

Please continue your efforts in this regard. Is there anything more constructive that can be done?

Enclosed is a booklet which appears sound but I'm not too sure of its origin. Perhaps you have knowledge of this group.

Thank you for your effort in this matter.  
DALE LEBER.

JULY 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to thank you for the stand you have taken against our military position in South Vietnam. I have used your arguments with friends and have urged them to write to the President to support your recommendation of withdrawing our troops. Thank you again for a just and brave fight.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LILLIAN MOED.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

FORT DODGE, IOWA,  
July 25, 1964.

Senator MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed find clipping from Toronto Star which proves to my mind that we are acting as a policeman for England and Commonwealth.

Also find article from U.S. News & World Report how England is building up Commonwealth and in many cases using us as a policeman and now are endeavoring to use us in Cyprus.

Of course, Commonwealth is nothing but the Empire under a different name, inasmuch as the Governor General in any of these commonwealth countries can veto any act of their Parliament.

Sincerely yours,

BEN H. BLACK.

P.S.—Congratulations on your fight to keep us out of Vietnam.

HILBROOK, MASS.,  
July 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I commend you highly upon your stand against the U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

Please keep up the fight.

Sincerely,

CELLE R. HOWES  
Mrs. C. R. HOWES.

SEBASCO ESTATES, MAINE,  
July 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I recently heard you talk on the "Today" show about South Vietnam. Later I heard Senator CHURCH and a State Department official. I couldn't agree with you more. The other two men impressed me as "dreamers" and having little understanding of the situation out there.

May I say I went to China in 1916 for the

Standard Oil Co., have traveled all over the Far East, visited Saigon many times, and think I have some understanding of the Chinese and other Asiatics. To me, it's a hopeless mess in South Vietnam. When talk is made, it may take from 2 to 20 years to win, it is not for us, and a hopeless situation. Suppose we do win, and then pull out, another upset in government could take place soon after. And then where are we? It's more vital to the French and English than to us but, they don't seem concerned. Am glad I don't have a son to be sent out there to give his life for the Government of Vietnam.

I am,

Yours very truly,

C. HOLDEN.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We in California support you in your fight for a reasonable settlement of the South Vietnam situation. We are pleased to read your speeches published in a few journals such as S. F. Stone's.

Keep up the good work.

M. MALCOLM.

ELLENSBURG, WASH.,  
July 24, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Since your opinions about Vietnam are on a line with my own, I'm sending you a booklet on the situation there. We should be ashamed if this booklet tells the truth.

I wonder also, if you have heard the latest British brainstorm, they wish the Russian indebtedness to the U.N. forgiven. Can't you just see this debt shoved onto us Americans so the shaky U.N. can be held together with us paying all its bills.

I am also very indignant about the way we treat Alaska, after their bad earthquake, no \$400 million for them like Yugoslavia and others, where, if anything happens we rush in millions of dollars, but not for our own, as is usual with our Government. I sympathize greatly with Governor Egan.

One more question, "Why does no other country help with the war in Vietnam?"

Mrs. OLGA JOHNSON.

NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J.,  
July 23, 1964.

Mr. PRESIDENT: We strongly urge that the present U.S. policy of maintaining the war in southeast Asia be abandoned, and that a cease-fire leading to a truce be declared. We feel that the U.S. Government is perpetuating the Indochinese war, a war in which the French colonial powers were defeated by a united action of the people of North and South Vietnam. The great majority of Vietnamese were opposed to French rule then, and are opposed to U.S. military intervention now. This opposition is based on an exclusively military policy of the United States which is totally divorced from the needs and desires of the Vietnamese populace. The United States has done nothing to win the spirit of the Vietnamese, but instead has sought only to prevail by military might and support of unpopular dictatorships. The inevitable outcome has been popular resentment and opposition. This has been recently shown by the widespread support which the populace is giving to the Vietcong guerrilla forces, and by the overthrowing of four-fifths of the "strategic hamlets." The opposition is further heightened by the realization of the Vietnamese that they are nothing but a pawn in the U.S. struggle to overcome communism.

Because the U.S. policy toward southeast Asia runs counter to the patriotic spirit of the citizens of southeast Asia so blatantly, we appeal to the Government to cease its unpopular war. We join with Senators FULBRIGHT, MANSFIELD, MORSE, and others in urging an immediate peaceful settlement.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. BARRY KOMISARUK.

WARRINGTON, PA.,  
July 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want to commend you on your position on Vietnam, and sincerely hope will continue to speak out on this vital question until a reasonable solution is reached.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. J. REED SUPLEE.

MADISON, WIS.,  
July 21, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to tell you that I wholehearted support your stand on Vietnam, and admire your courage to speak them publicly.

I am very concerned about this situation, but feel very impotent to do anything about it. It is of some comfort to know there are some in places of power who share my concern.

Very truly yours,

MARGARET C. McHAFFEY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
July 21, 1964.

I back your policy on Vietnam. The world needs peace.

NICK GRANICH.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,  
July 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your courageous fight against the saber rattlers. The people want their children to be builders, not wreckers of humanity.

Sincerely,

WALTER ROGERS.

TACOMA, WASH.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Two hundred at fellowship of reconciliation conference, Seabeck, Wash., unanimously support your courageous Vietnam position.

CURTIS CARMEAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,  
July 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Again we thank you for standing for what is right, honest, and therefore patriotic in foreign affairs.

The "generals" in South Vietnam are now said to be planning to destroy a village in North Vietnam in reprisal for each village in South Vietnam overrun by Vietcong; also to destroy an industrial plant in North Vietnam for each leader killed by South Vietnam (Philadelphia Inquirer, July 10).

The generals keep talking about war with North Vietnam which means war with China. Is that what they really want?

Power to you is our hope and prayer and belief.

Most sincerely yours,

ARTHUR and HELEN BERTHOLF.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your intelligent outspokenness in the cause of peace. In fact thank you for your courageous stand on so many vital issues over the years of your shining service to our country. Seeing the upsurge of recent political forces makes us appreciate you all the more.

PHYLLIS LAVAY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
July 20, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are the conscience of America in the U.S. Senate. A true representative of the people by every stand-



18552

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 12

ard; having the integrity to defy the craven silence of conformity at the risk of your political career; in your service to the Nation and the people by exposing on their behalf the facts and the perilous nature of the U.S. illegal and immoral intervention by force on the side of tyranny in a strife-torn nation; by your defense of humanity, of the lives of American youth and innocent Vietnamese, appealing to substitute for this carnage a legal and just solution of this South Vietnamese conflict, in accordance with law and the obligations of our country.

Your tireless condemnation of the evil course being pursued in southeast Asia by our policymakers in Washington will in later years be accorded the same honor as is bestowed on all public men of stature in our history, while the authors of brute force and rash expediency in our foreign affairs will continue to earn the scorn and hostility of an aggrieved humanity.

With some honorable exceptions, your colleagues in the Senate listen to your reasoned exhortations with impassive silence. Yet you are not speaking primarily to them. You are a tribune of the people in the U.S. Senate and across our broad land they are heeding your voice. In due time they will be heard from, more and more, and more insistently. They will give their answer to this monumental lawless folly and will demand an accounting for the lives and substance wasted.

Thank you for portions of the March 30 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing letters supporting your position which I received. I understand additional such letters have since been inserted in the RECORD. I would appreciate receiving the RECORD pages containing them, as I am reproducing these letters for distribution as being vitally necessary, not only to show the uninformed how vast numbers of Americans are opposed to the administration's wrong policy in southeast Asia, but to counter with facts the suppression and falsification of them by the venal press which is paralyzing the American people's will to peace.

Cordially yours,

FRANK A. KONDRAT.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: July 21 is the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Geneva agreements of 1954. It is a fitting time to review that event and its immediate aftermath as providing the source of the original errors and transgressions in our policy and acts toward the southeast Asian region. The seed was then planted for the bloody and futile harvest the present administration is now reaping.

Trusting that it may be helpful in your debate on South Vietnam, I am appending to the enclosed letter documented facts on violations of the Geneva agreements at that early stage by the United States.

The facts are in excerpts of a dispatch by journalist Wilfred Burchett from South Vietnam to the National Guardian of July 18. Burchett reports as an eyewitness of the conflict from the scene of fighting. They say the National Guardian is a left wing journal. Judging from its contents, it presents the people's side of all important domestic and foreign issues.

But where today can one turn for the truth? In general, the respectable press, beholden to the merchants of war, only mirrors the official line, with its affirmations followed by denials, its contradictions, secrecy, and unproven allegations. As in a case of law, more so in the southeast Asian crisis, one must look on both sides to glean some truth, and I seek the truth wherever it may be found. However, Burchett confines himself to documents and facts estab-

lished by history. Excerpts from his dispatch follow:

"The late John Foster Dulles did his best to stifle the Geneva Conference at birth, trying to turn it into a forum to drum up international intervention in la Korea. When this failed, Dulles stalked out and left it to the expendable Walter Bedell Smith to carry on the sabotage. But the conference produced realistic agreements based on sensible compromises. Bedell did not sign them—and he was the only delegate not to get a cheer from the waiting crowd as delegates left the conference hall.

"Before he left, Bedell Smith issued a declaration that the United States would refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb the agreements and 'would view any renewal of aggression in violation of the aforesaid agreements with grave concern.'

"Included in the declaration was a reference to the agreement on elections, due to be held July 20, 1956: 'In connection with free elections, in Vietnam, my Government wishes to make clear its position. In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections, supervised by the U.N. to ensure that they are conducted freely.'

"This was already serving notice that the United States would sabotage the key paragraphs regarding the holding of elections, to be supervised not by the U.N., which never had anything to do with the Indochina war or the cease-fire negotiations, but by an international supervisory commission made up of India, Poland and Canada. Also, Vietnam at that time was not divided. In order to separate the combatants, a temporary line was to be established along the 17th parallel, to the north and south of which the combatant forces were to withdraw.

"The agreement, signed by all the participants except the United States, states:

"The conference recognizes that the essential purpose of the agreement relating to Vietnam is to settle military questions with a view to ending hostilities and that the military demarcation line should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary."

"But Bedell Smith, literally before the ink was dry on the documents, already considered the temporary demarcation line a permanent political boundary and Vietnam a country 'divided against its will.'

"July 20, 1955, should have been the date for opening the consultative conference to arrange for the elections a year later. The authorities in the North were prepared to arrange electoral procedures meeting Western requirements for free and secret balloting. But no such meeting took place because U.S. policy was against elections under any circumstances. Instead, on July 20, 20 truckloads of Diemist stormtroops converged on the headquarters of the International Supervisory Commission in Saigon, smashed and looted the building and set fire to many cars.

"Has Secretary Dean Rusk forgotten all about this when he talks about violation of the Geneva agreements by North Vietnam being responsible for the war in the South?

"Article 17a states: 'With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the introduction into Vietnam of any reinforcements in the form of all types of arms, munitions and other war material such as combat aircraft, naval craft, pieces of ordnance, jet engines and jet weapons or armored vehicles is prohibited.'

"Early in 1955, Washington and London raised charges of illegal import of weapons 'enough for three divisions into North Vietnam.' The French reluctantly demanded an international commission inquiry. The French knew the charge was false because it was they who had designated the points along the Vietnam-Chinese frontier where

permanent control teams were stationed. But a complaint was made and mobile teams of the commission were sent to investigate the routes along which tanks and artillery were said to be passing. They learned that the supposed roads and tracks were nonexistent or had long been destroyed. The charges were rejected. They were made only to cover up large imports of U.S. arms which started within months of the signing of the ceasefire agreements, and have continued on an ever-increasing scale since.

"There were no elections in July 1956. Instead the U.S. plan for reunification was being put into effect—to build up a huge army in the south and prepare for the march to the north. On graduating at the U.S.-run military academy at Dalat, students had to take the oath that they would march to the north; they received 'march to the north' armbands. Maybe Rusk does not know about this. Or about the groups of air-dropped U.S.-trained commandos dropped at least once a month into North Vietnam, right up to July 1964, from U.S. planes or landed along the North Vietnam coast from U.S. naval craft."

Submitted to the senior Senator from Oregon in the interest of truth concerning U.S. involvement in the war in South Vietnam and to help promote a peaceful solution of that needless conflict.

FRANK A. KONDRAT.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY,

East Lansing, Mich., July 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been following eagerly the reports in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of your attacks upon the unlawful war in South Vietnam, and I wish to express my agreement with the position you have taken, as well as my admiration for your moral strength in continuing to protest in the face of a news blackout. I earnestly hope that you and the other few Senators who have joined you will go on. You are speaking out, not only for yourselves and those who elected you, but for hundreds of thousands—probably millions—across the country who are denied their own constitutional voices by the refusal of their elected representatives to really give thought to the issues involved.

I wrote to Senator HART in May, urging him to support you, but his response indicated that he felt he should leave the matter up to the President. He is up for reelection, but his opponent is probably just as afraid of the issue. Where is our two-party system? Where is our representative Government?

I cannot cast a vote for you, Senator; I do not live in Oregon. But in the name of honesty, justice, and the ideals of freedom for which our country stands I beseech you not to give up. Day by day, voices across the country are joining yours.

I know you are a very busy man with many commitments, but could you come to our university to speak on the subject of the illegal war? (sometime in the fall—perhaps after the election). I'm afraid there are few Oregonians here, but to whom can we turn?

Thank you for your kind attention.

Sincerely,

BRIAN R. KLEHER.

CHICAGO, ILL.

July 20, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your stand against our participation in the war of Vietnam. We as a nation need to take an honest look at what we are doing there. The only conclusion to be reached is that poor motives have brought us into and keep us involved in this farce.

1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18553

I am thankful that there are such as you in our Senate. Please know that we support your efforts to end the arms race and the cold war that the right extremists need so badly.

I regret that I am not among those who can show their support at the polls. I will, however, make my views known to the Senators representing my State.

Yours sincerely,

DONALD C. MIKULECKY, Ph. D.

THE WEIZMANN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE,  
Rehovoth, Israel, July 19, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: While I'm a New Yorker and cannot have the pleasure of voting for you, I would still like to express my gratitude for your excellent work. I refer primarily (at the moment) to your powerful words and thoughts about the doings in Vietnam. The present policy is futile, and, worse than that, it is aimless. A pity that the Republican opposition wants to push the fiasco still further. Pressure from thinking people must grow stronger if commonsense is to prevail.

Sincerely,

V. A. PARSEGHIAN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
APO 334, July 20, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: After reading your outstanding and timely speech about the U.S. foreign policy in Vietnam, I would like to speak out as a U.S. citizen, a voter, a mother, wife of a serviceman.

The growing concern of the people of the Pacific, the statesiders residing here, the service people, concerning Vietnam is considerable. Each feels that U.S. policy should certainly be reviewed before we are drawn into a more severe catastrophe. Most feel as I do, that we should withdraw completely. This needless waste of life and property when all the evidence shows not only to the Communists, but to the world as a whole that the position of the United States in Vietnam has resulted in fiasco.

In theory, the Government is governed by the people. When the people want to abandon a policy, is it in some way possible to achieve this?

Sincerely,

Mrs. BARBARA CROUCH.

DALLAS, TEX.,  
July 20, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I want you to know that I appreciate the stand that you are taking on the undeclared war in South Vietnam. We need more men like you and your way of thinking. I have always noted and appreciated your outstanding work in the Senate. I think that your endeavor has been of some good because without it I'm sure that we would be deeper in war than we are at present. If those others framing our foreign policy could see it in the light as you, I believe we would be treading further away from the brink of all-out war.

Here's hoping you much success in your efforts and the hope that someday you may become our President.

Sincerely,

Mrs. BONNIE F. ATKINS.

ADELPHI, MD.,  
July 20, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is very delayed action but I can't let your interviews on

"Face the Nation" and "Issues and Answers" go by without telling you how glad I was that some of the news media finally let the Nation hear your views on Vietnam.

I think your view is the only real honest one and you did a fine job of presenting it.

I hope someday in the not too distant future the United States can present a foreign policy to the world which is honest and respectable, based on fact instead of fiction.

As I study the French and American Revolutions of the 18th century, it seems to me that there and then is where the seeds of this cold war were planted, and they just came into full bloom after World War II. I see communism and our democracy as two different phases of democracy, political and economic, which should be working together instead of being at loggerheads with one another.

Democracy has many meanings, but if it has a moral, it is found in resolving that the supreme test of all political institutions and industrial arrangements shall be the contribution they make to the all-round growth of every member of a society.

Our shortcomings are proof that you cannot have political equality so long as the power remains in the hands of a few who control the economy.

If our economic "czars" would only release their hold on the news media and educational system it would help a lot to bring about a little more political equality for us.

I think Russia and the United States have a lot to learn from one another. Such themes as the ones espoused by GOLDWATER and MILLER just can't be accepted by our Nation, it would be suicide for us.

I wish there was some way I could do more to help the better man win even though I can't wholeheartedly support this administration's foreign policies.

I must quit; please keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mrs. BERNICE THOMPSON.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,  
July 20, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Permit me, sir, at long last to express to you my deep appreciation of your sincere efforts to publicize "the dirty war" in South Vietnam. I agree with you that it is a sinkhole for untold American dollars; it is a brutal war and a war that the United States of America has a good chance of losing anyway.

The war in South Vietnam will in due time hurt our standing in the U.N. I am opposed to "the dirty war" because it will tarnish our image as the greatest democracy in the world, and support you 100 percent in your campaign to withdraw American Armed Forces from South Vietnam. I admire the courage of yourself and others in the U.S. Senate for your forthright stand against it in the Foreign Affairs Committee. Good luck to you and may you achieve your goal of bringing our country to its senses. Thanking you for same, I am,

Very truly yours,

EDWARD K. FIELD.

LAKE GEORGE, N.Y.,  
July 21, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Once in a while a bare line or two creeps into the local papers about your stand on the Asian business and your position as to its constitutionality. More power to you.

Wouldn't it help, though, if some democratic method of safeguarding the Constitution could be established? Right now you and I both believe the President is making war without a declaration and the consent of Congress; and hence unconstitutionally. But there is no machinery for bringing the issue before the Supreme Court by way of a request for a restraining order. Power to

seek such orders should be placed somewhere—maybe in a certain percentage (5 to 10 percent) of the Governors; maybe in a petition by a certain percentage of the population or of the voters.

Further, shouldn't there be penalties—harsh penalties—for public officials who violate the Constitution as well as for any—inside the Government or out—who inform the Congress falsely on matters involving peace and war?

Finally—and this how arises from related personal experience—since those successfully demonstrating the unconstitutionality of a legislative action have done a service to every citizen, a fund should be provided out of which to reimburse such citizens for their costs. This is simple justice. (The related personal experience to which I referred happened in recent months in Virginia where it cost me 50 percent of a \$4,300 collection to prove that a local attorney serving as a trustee did not have the right to make a personal collection from the money held in trust.)

The cost of defending our constitutional rights should be borne by all.

We are all for you.

GEORGE H. ENGEMAN.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,  
July 18, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your unceasing effort against the senseless war in Vietnam. Doesn't our State Department know that Western white imperialism is way out of date and self defeating?

What about a conference for the neutralization of southeast Asia?

Cordially,

GEORGE L. COLLINS.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,  
July 17, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have read what you said about the situation in Vietnam, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 21, 1964, and hope that you will continue to repeat this opposition to war in Vietnam as often as possible. Since the war seems to be going on and on to our shame, it seems as though Congress should take some action or that in some way the United States should quickly bring the problem to the United Nations.

I am horrified that our military forces are conducting "scorched earth" operations, destroying food supplies, homes and means of livelihood. I have read that there are not enough hospitals in Vietnam to hold the men, women and children who have been wounded. If only the United States could have a civilized foreign policy, based on negotiation, and such projects as the Peace Corps. Instead we are continuing a futile military policy based on anti-communism, inherited from a previous era, which has no real solution to offer to the world's problems.

Sincerely,

MARGARET H. SMITH.

JULY 17, 1964.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
President of the United States of America,  
The White House, Washington, D.C.

Mr. PRESIDENT: For some months I have been deeply concerned at the relationship between our country and Communist China and just what course these two countries are heading on, toward what goal.

At the conclusion of World War II, I ended up in Japan, serving in the Marine Corps, where we performed temporary duty until Regular Army forces arrived. It was my privilege at that time to become acquainted with many Japanese citizens and today correspondence is still exchanged. Further, in the course of our duties the horror of the destruction at Nagasaki was seen firsthand and there is no need to detail the revulsion

18554

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 12

this caused within one—especially the feeling of guilt as a representative of a so-called Christian nation. This plus observing the clamor by so-called "regulars" among the officers for the opening of houses of prostitution washed up my confidence in the military as determiners of foreign policy and foreign relations.

Though we were armed to the teeth when we landed on Kyushu, we were greeted with obvious kindness by the citizens and in no time thousands of friendships were established by the troops and the people.

The reason all this is detailed is because of another experience between two sides at "war" in 1939 when I worked at the New York World's Fair. The teamster union president and the chief engineer of the fair stood on so-called "principle" and neither would move to settle a "quickie" strike.

Feeling a concern to both sides, I walked a mile to the restaurant where the union leader was sitting and, after sipping a Coke and having a little conversation, we returned to the office and all was settled.

This all adds up, to me, to mean that the people down the line, whether it be countries or organizations, want to understand each other and when they do get together all problems seem to evaporate.

I am sure there are millions of Chinese, just as there are millions of Americans, who do want to get along and understand each other's problems. In view of all this, it would seem some sort of a drastic new look should be taken at our foreign policy and especially as regards China. Furthermore, it could have great financial benefit for our country.

Today I read in the San Diego papers of the great increase in business passing through our local port and much of this is attributable to the trade with "our 1940-45 bitter enemy" Japan. Now we are feuding with our then great ally China. The opening up of trade with China could be a great source of increased business to the entire west coast and especially San Diego, which now faces the shutting down of various naval facilities.

Rather than clamor "foul" at the administration when it tries to save a dollar and then go to San Francisco and write pious platforms about private enterprise and against Federal spending, our local leaders would do better to look for new and permanent sources of income.

Finally, is it not possible to have the United Nations handle some of the complex problems of Asia? It was set up just for this purpose, I thought, and it would remove us from the front line of trying to settle every problem all over the world.

The length of this letter is regrettable but all of these serious problems have been building up in me for some time and perhaps if everyone concerned would speak up a solution might be forthcoming.

With sincere appreciation for the magnitude of your job and with assurance that you have the prayers of my good family and the writer, I am,

Most sincerely,

WALTER G. HOOKE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
July 17, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I should like to commend you on the courageous stand you have taken insofar as the war in Vietnam is concerned. I agree with your position that we should recall our troops, and that this matter should be handled diplomatically, and not by military might.

I trust you will continue your difficult fight. I am sure there are many people behind you.

Respectfully,

MARGARET GINSBURG.

WAYLAND, MICH.,

July 20, 1964.

DEAR SIR: You were so right when you said, "McNamara's war." I have read letters from South Vietnam servicemen and all they have is soap and salt to give to the tribesmen and think that will win the war. What a shame putting our men so far from home and loved ones with no better cause. (Look into this.)

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,

July 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I add my voice to that of the GI who said, "Let's get out of Vietnam." I agree that unilateral action is condoning anarchy and inviting more war. Do continue with your excellent speeches like those before newsmen on the CBS network where you knew more facts than any of them.

Keep up the commonsense.

Mrs. W. B. MOREL.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA.,

July 18, 1964.

DEAR SIR: I urge you please to consider running for Vice President. You are a man of guts and determination. I can think of no high praise than to say, "Sir, you are no politician."

E. FOSTER.

VINEYARD HAVEN, MASS.,

July 17, 1964.

This card is written to express our appreciation for your recent exposition and criticism of the moral, legal, and practical positions in which this Nation is finding itself in connection with the unilateral interventions in southeast Asia.

PHILIP W. L. COX.

SEATTLE, WASH.,

July 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for all you are doing to work for peace in Vietnam. This is so very important, and it is encouraging to have a man of your stature doing so much.

Sincerely yours,

FLORENCE HORNIG.

JAMAICA PLAIN, MASS.

DEAR SIR: I commend your views on Vietnam, and have written the President to urge him to seek negotiations—the 14-nation Geneva Conference reconvened.

Since many young Republicans are going over to Johnson for fear of Goldwater's militancy—Johnson will score if his stand is firm against escalating the war.

Sincerely,

ELNA SHERMAN.

[From Circulating Pines, Circle Pines, Minn.,  
July 9, 1964]

IGNORED NEWS

The Circulating Pines is fortunate in having a staff member (Lee Burgard) who reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is the only way we would know that there is opposition on Capitol Hill to our Government's policy in South Vietnam.

This opposition is being largely ignored by the press as a whole, and this is not fair to the American people. They deserve to see a matter as serious as this fully discussed.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, who has consistently suggested that the United Nations be asked to recommend a solution, says his mail is running 100 to 1 in favor of his position. In a speech delivered July 1, MORSE says:

"The appointment of General Taylor as Ambassador to South Vietnam increases the possibility of our going into a full-scale war in Asia if the Red Chinese and the North Vietnamese do not back down under American threats.

"There is a growing trend in this Republic

for the military to take over more and more policy determinations. I had hoped that we would make it more clear than it has been made to date that under our constitutional system it is not for the military to determine policy, but to carry out orders; and that American foreign policy should be determined by the civilian branch of the Government—by the President, his chief agent, the Secretary of State, and the Congress.

"The symbolism of putting this general behind an Ambassador's desk in South Vietnam is uncalled for and unfortunate. It will be subject to great misunderstanding, and will accrue to the great disadvantage of the standing of the United States in many parts of the world, particularly in the so-called underdeveloped nations.

"General Taylor is among those in the Pentagon who has an itchy trigger finger when it comes to the use of nuclear power in case we are challenged and our bluff is called. I want to avoid those challenges.

"I would, as I have said so many times, while the matter is before a 14-nation conference, as recommended by De Gaulle, or before the Security Council or before the General Assembly, call upon our alleged—and I underline the word "alleged"—SEATO allies to join us with a sufficient body of men to patrol the area, to keep the adversaries separate, and to stop the killing and warring until the procedures of the United Nations can be brought to work upon the threat to the peace of Asia and, potentially, the peace of the world."

TACOMA, WASH.,

July 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We commend you for your forthright position on the war in Vietnam. We share your conviction that not one American boy should be sacrificed in this unjust and unnecessary war. We know it takes courage to speak out these days and want you to know we appreciate your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN SPRUELL.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,

July 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: You continue to fight on, almost alone, to save the United States and perhaps the world; may you live long to continue the struggle and may the blind be given sight to see the chasm ahead.

If it were possible I would like a copy of all your speeches made against our involvement in Vietnam and on the Asiatic mainland. Also your 25-page minority report on "aid" of July 13.

With all the best to you.

Yours truly,

D. W. CONDE.

[From the New York Times, May 16, 1964]  
FOR KOREA'S UNIFICATION

To the EDITOR:

In the New York Times of April 24 you carried a reasoned and eloquent plea for the despoiled people of South Korea by Yong-jeung Kim of the Korean Affairs Institute. It is my hope that policy planners in Washington took note of it.

In his letter Mr. Kim states (among the struggles of the South Korean students against the soldiers and police) that the struggle for unification of north and south "cannot be stopped by force." And in this he is correct.

I would observe that it has been the role of General Park, who seized power in May 1961 in a coup d'etat, to be the "force" that has sought to prevent peaceful unification, but his departure is now in sight.

Is it not painfully obvious that U.S. policy has failed miserably in South Korea? That the time has come gracefully but hastily to withdraw? For the sake of history we should



1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18555

halt all secret or open efforts to force South Korea again into the arms of the Japanese.

DAVID W. W. CONDE.

OAKLAND, CALIF., May 4, 1964.

(The writer of the above letter served as staff section chief under Gen. Douglas MacArthur and was a Reuters correspondent in Japan.)

KINCHELOE, AIR FORCE BASE, MICH.,  
July 17, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The settlement in Laos was a time-buying device, and now the time we bought is about to run out, with the Communists taking the country over unless we fight them to prevent it. So Laos has come to the same pass as South Vietnam. Both countries are being attacked by North Vietnam, using partly its regular troops and partly irregulars transparently disguised as internal rebels. The disguised nature of the North Vietnamese aggression is taken as giving North Vietnam the status under international law of a neutral, with the protection from counterattack which that status affords. But surely if international law means anything it deals with practical realities, not with polite fictions. We have not the slightest obligation to treat North Vietnam as if it were not at war with South Vietnamese allies and with us. We should prevent North Vietnamese reinforcements and supplies from reaching Laos or South Vietnam, and in doing so there is no reason why we should stay on this side of the North Vietnamese border. I believe Congress should now declare a state of war between the United States and North Vietnam; and we should bomb all of North Vietnam's military installations, factories, rail centers, fuel storage facilities and ports, and destroy all North Vietnamese ships and aircraft. This could be done in a week, and then the situation in South Vietnam and Laos would suddenly take on quite a different aspect.

Ho Chi Minh will not surrender, and we should not expect to be able to end the war quickly. It will be a long and terrible war, whether we counterattack into North Vietnam or not. If we do, it will not be a hopeless war as it is at present.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT POWELL.

PRINCETON, N.J.,  
July 16, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Normally, I would never have thought of writing to you. I am not one of your constituents; indeed, I have never had the good fortune to be in Oregon. But in days such as the present ones I feel that I must let you know how much I respect you for many of the positions which you have taken recently on foreign and domestic affairs.

Now that Senator GOLDWATER has become the Republican presidential candidate the danger increases that many of his opponents will continue to mention him and the forces behind him as excuses for the character of many U.S. policies. I hope that you will criticize anyone who attempts to justify the continuance of bad policies by saying that any attempt to implement better ones would provide political ammunition to the Goldwater forces.

I am sure that you will continue to become increasingly outspoken about such issues as peace, disarmament, Cuba, southeast Asia, and civil rights.

Very truly yours,

DR. WALTER STRUVE.

PLEASANT RIDGE, MICH.,  
July 16, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just been reading some of your supporters' letters in

the July 9, 1964, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I would like to add mine to your collection.

You are doing an outstanding job in the Senate on this issue day after day and deserve the good wishes of all Americans. Keep it up.

Sincerely,

J. B. GORDON.

P.C.—I would appreciate being placed on the mailing list for your newsletters.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
July 13, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: In what capacity is the United States militarily responsible for the perpetuation of the present South Vietnamese regime? What qualities has this regime which guarantee the freedoms of the South Vietnamese people?

If it is our aim to prevent the spread of communism, perhaps a more practical solution, and certainly a more preferable solution, would be to eliminate the conditions which foster uprising; eliminate the conditions, not the people.

Our position is detestable morally.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN B. READ.

MOBERLY, MO.,  
July 15, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senator from Oregon,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for your courageous stand and the vigorous way in which you have opposed our Government's intervention in Vietnam. The Post Dispatch recently has given you considerable space, as you probably know. They had a fine editorial praising you for your daily speech in the Senate, voicing your opposition to this immoral and cruel war, and they carried a three-column reprint of one of your speeches in which you pointed out that we have no legal right to engage in this war. I presume you have copies of this material.

You speak for a great many conscientious people, not only on this subject, but on many others. I recall your fight against the Telstar deal which the Government turned over to A.T. & T.; and many other similar positions where you represented the people's interests. It is a great satisfaction to have Senator WAYNE MORSE in Washington to counteract to some extent the Goldwaters, the Smathers, Eastlands, et al. If there were more of you and fewer of the latter, our country and the world in general would be a more just and peaceful place.

Yours very truly,

MARY CHRISTIAN.

PENFIELD, N.Y.,  
July 16, 1964.

The U.S. SENATE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have several times read over your May 27 speech to the Senate and the text of the May 24, 1964, "Face the Nation" television program.

I want to give you every possible encouragement in your good efforts to bring us to our senses as a nation with respect to our southeast Asia policy.

Sincerely yours,

W. EUGENE NOTZ, M.D.

WABAN, MASS.,  
July 16, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a word of appreciation for the vallant efforts which you are making to keep our country from be-

coming involved further in military conflict in southeast Asia.

I fear greatly the recent escalation of the conflict, particularly, by our Government.

I am firmly convinced that it is against the best interests of the United States to continue participation in this war. It actually weakens our military security while harming our diplomatic posture.

Again, thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Sincerely,

JEROME GROSSMAN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
July 11, 1964.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As an Oregon Democrat, I've been tremendously proud of our State's representation and rather guilty not to have expressed my feeling to you, to EDITH GREEN, and to MAURINE NEUBERGER.

Now, with the bitter truth about Vietnam breaking out at long last, may I thank you and all other courageous protesters who are, I'm sure, standing with you. WILLIAM RYAN's recent speech in the House was heartening. It is most unfortunate that the press, radio, and TV do not give good coverage to controversial speeches and debate. It seems to me and my friends of liberal faith that now is the heaven-sent opportunity for the United States to do the obvious: Demonstrate alleged faith in the United Nations and lead the world toward a real détente. We cannot understand those who want to save face militarily while they refuse to face the realities of the atomic age.

Thank you, Senator, and more strength to you.

Sincerely yours,

ALICE B. PLYMPTON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
July 9, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I realize you are making an intensive study of the situation in South Vietnam, the importance of which you fully realize. I urge you, Mr. President, not to be pressured into making a military commitment that would lead us into war with Red China. I urge you, on the other hand, to explore every avenue available that might lead to a peaceful settlement. The voice of reason and the long view are needed here.

In spite of the fact that you must receive many letters urging immediate military expansion, I know there are many Americans who feel as I do about this.

Very truly yours,

MARY M. FERNANDEZ.

(Copy to Senator WAYNE MORSE.)

# AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which I offer for myself and the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, at the end of section 620 (a) inserted in the bill by Senate amendment, relating to limitation on aggregate authorization

18556

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 12

for use in fiscal year 1965, strike the period, insert a semicolon, and add the following:

*Provided, That an additional \$50,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the purchase of domestically produced beef, poultry and other meats and meat products, dairy products, rice and other high protein foods, in adequate supply in the United States, for donation to school lunch and similar programs in foreign countries eligible for assistance under this Act.*

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I shall take only a brief time to explain the amendment. I believe it will be accepted by every Member of the Senate. I have discussed it with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. He indicated that he is willing to accept the amendment. I have also discussed it with the leadership and with numerous other Members of the Senate, and they support the amendment.

In effect, the amendment authorizes the appropriation of \$50 million under the authority of the foreign aid bill now before the Senate for the purchase of domestically produced beef, poultry, and other meats and meat products, dairy products, rice, and other high-protein foods which are in adequate supply in the United States for donation to school lunch and similar programs in foreign countries which are eligible for assistance under the bill.

I believe the amendment is a perfect combination of our domestic self-interest with the most solid kind of humanitarian program.

We have heard much discussion in the Senate during the past few days about some of the inadequacies of our foreign aid operations. There are inadequacies. There are some parts of the program that should be corrected.

But one aspect of our overseas aid program that should bring pride to every Member of Congress, and to every American, is our overseas school lunch program. We are now feeding about 40 million schoolchildren every day through our food for peace program. The results of that program have been most inspiring, not only in terms of the remarkable improvement in health on the part of the youngsters who receive the food, but also in terms of improved school attendance and improved academic performance.

Some years ago, Prime Minister Nehru, of India, stated that one cannot talk of God to a starving person. By the same reasoning, an effective job cannot be done of educating boys and girls who are hungry, who are too weak and lethargic to sit through classroom instruction. Amazing results have been achieved by

the feeding of youngsters in some 80 countries.

One of the limitations of the program has been the lack of high protein food. Under existing authority, we have not had the power to purchase beef and other meat products or the high protein foods that are desperately needed. There is no single lack in the world today that undermines human health more than the lack of protein foods.

There is an extremely critical shortage of such foods all across Africa, Asia, large parts of Latin America, and the Middle East. In fact, some authorities say that almost no child on the entire Continent of Africa escapes the ravages of protein deficiency. There is a terrible disease known as kwashiorkor, which is another name for protein deficiency. It is this tragic lack of protein in the diets of the youngsters of Africa and in most of the other underdeveloped parts of the world that causes the skinny arms and legs, the distended bellies, and the gaunt faces of the children we see when we visit underdeveloped countries.

The only way to correct that condition is by providing additional protein foods, as would be authorized by this amendment.

We should also consider the amendment I have offered from the standpoint of our own interests.

The amendment will be of great value to American producers. We all know that American livestock producers have been in serious economic trouble for more than a year. This amendment offers an opportunity to take off the market some of the surplus beef that is produced in this country. The amendment provides that the beef to be used must be domestically produced and used for the relief of boys and girls overseas through school lunch and similar programs.

Our dairy producers and some of the other producers who would be assisted by the amendment have also had problems of surpluses, which this could help relieve.

At the present time, I am advised that our stocks of nonfat dried milk are quite low. We had only 123 million pounds uncommitted July 24 compared to 472 million pounds at the same time last year. The voluntary agencies, which have asked for 850 million pounds this year, have been assured only 400 million. It would be tragic if this commodity, which is the backbone of some of our school aid projects abroad, should be suddenly cut off or drastically cut back and we should abandon millions of children to want and hunger again.

I do not know of any program in our entire farm aid operation that deserves our support more than does the effort to contribute to the improvement of the health and well-being of schoolchildren in the developing countries.

During the past week, the country has marked the 90th birthday of former President Herbert Hoover. Mr. Hoover is known around the world, not so much because he was President of the United States, important and significant as that honor was, but because he brought America's agricultural abundance to

bear on the solution of the problems of world hunger. It is no accident that former President Hoover has devoted a good part of his recent years to the writing of a four-volume work on our overseas food programs. It is a high tribute to President Hoover that he handled that program with the broad vision and deep sense of humanity that he manifested, both in the years during and after World War I and again after World War II, when he was asked by President Truman to direct or advise on the feeding of the hungry people in the war-torn countries of Europe and in Japan.

One of the most remarkable of our post World War II efforts was the school lunch program directed by Gen. Douglas MacArthur in Japan, a program which is paying great dividends to the people of Japan and the people of the United States. The health and well-being of a whole generation of Japanese young people were greatly strengthened by the overseas school lunch programs that were directed by General MacArthur in the postwar period. It is one of the great achievements in the life of that renowned general. Today, thanks in part to that program, Japan is the biggest commercial, hard-money purchaser of American agricultural commodities in the world.

Mr. President, this is a hardheaded program. The schoolchildren we help today with the school lunch program, who learn to enjoy and benefit by American milk, American meat, and American agricultural products, will be our customers tomorrow. This program is definitely in the interest of American agricultural producers. It is in the interest of people who are trying to assist overseas. In the best sense of the word, it is food for peace in action.

I am much pleased that the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and who has traveled widely and observed these programs in various parts of the world, has joined me as a cosponsor of the amendment.

I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is a privilege to be a joint sponsor of the amendment with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN]. Not only will the amendment help the people whom we intend it to help under the foreign aid program, it will also help the American farmer.

The fact that we reduced the foreign aid bill last evening by several hundred million is the only reason why we did not include a considerably larger figure for this worthy cause. Nevertheless, I am gratified to know, as I know my able friend from South Dakota is, as a result of the actions of the administration in recent days and weeks, that beef prices, which had been falling in a serious, if not critical fashion, have improved.

It is this type of program that I believe will make it possible for the cattlemen and those engaged in the poultry, dairy products, ricegrowing, and other high-protein food industries, to have a